

The Classical Review

MAY 1896.

A THEORY OF THE CULEX.

IANUS PARRASIUS in his ingenious work *de rebus per epistolam quaesitis* (1567), citing the verses in which the writer of the *Culex* describes the shepherd as driving his goats into shade in order to escape the heat of the midday sun,

Ut procul aspexit luco residere uirenti,
Delia diua tuo, quo quondam uicta furore
Venit Nyctelium fugiens Cadmeis Agaue,
Infandas scelerata manus et caede cruenta:
Quae gelidis bacchata iugis requieuit in
antro

Posterius poenam nati de morte datura—

identified the grove, here introduced and described at length in vv. 121–156, with a place mentioned by Lucan vi. 355 *sqq.*

Atque olim Larisa potens, ubi nobile quon-
dam

Nunc super Argos arant, ueteres ubi fabula
Thebas

Monstrat Echionias, ubi quondam Pentheos
exul

Colla caputque ferens supremo tradidit igni,
Questa quod hoc solum nato rapuisset
Agaue.

Lucan, cataloguing some of the Thessalian cities, comes to Larisa, once called Argos, and in the vicinity of a traditional city Thebes, whither, according to ancient legend, Agave, fresh from the murder of her son Pentheus, carried his head and neck, and burnt them on a funeral pyre. This Thebes is sometimes explained to be the

NO. LXXXVII. VOL. X.

Phthiotid Thebes which Polybius states to have been 300 stadia from Larisa. It seems more probable that it was a ruined site much nearer to Larisa; from which the name might be transferred later to the more distant Phthiotid Thebes.¹

This must be a question for geographers. But so much is clear, that a legend, which seems to be rare, connected the foundation of this Thessalian Thebes with the more famous Thebes in Boeotia through Agave, a descendant of the royal stock of Cadmus, the mother and murderess of Pentheus.

In the poem itself there are no certain indications of Thessaly.² Neither *gratissima tempe* 94 nor *procedit uesper ab Oeta* 203 can prove the locale of the incident to be Thessalian. What is more, the tradition mentioned by Lucan (if the passage is genuine, which was denied by Bentley) is not the most accredited account. Agave, according to Hyginus *Fab.* 184, *ut suae mentis compos facta est, et uidit se Liberi impulsu tantum scelus admisisse, profugit ab Thebis, atque errabunda in Illyriae fines deuenit, ad Lycothersem regem. quam Lycotherses excepit.* Hyginus repeats this *Fab.* 240. If the end of Euripides' *Bacchae* had

¹ Meineke, however, *Anal. Alexandr.* p. 204 explains Lucan's *Echionias Thebas*, perhaps more probably, of the Thessalian Echinus which, like the Echinus of Acarnania, traced its origin to Echion.

² The Bern. schol. on Luc. iii. 189 *Encaelae uersi testantes f. C.* cannot be right in calling the *Encheliae* a Thessalian people. *Enchelia gens Thessaliae in cuius finibus Cadmus cum Harmonia uxor in serpentes sunt uersi. Enchelys dicitur anguilla, unde ciuitas est appellata.*

come to us entire, we should have known where Agave went, when she was banished from Thebes. As it is, we find her separated from her parents, Cadmus and Harmonia, and these latter, not Agave, despatched to Illyria (1362, cf. 1334 *sqq.*). Apollonius *Arg.* iv. 516 *sqq.* places the tomb of Cadmus and Harmonia in the territory of the Enchelees¹ by the Illyrian river of the black deeps²

οἱ δ' ἄρ' ἐπ' Ἰλλυρικῷ μελαμβαθέος ποταμοῖο,
τύμβος ἴν' Ἀρμονίης Κάδμου τε, πύργον ἔδει-
μαν
ἀνδράσιν Ἐγγελέσσιν ἐφέστιοι.

Callimachus in a fragment quoted by Strabo 46

οἱ μὲν ἐπ' Ἰλλυρικῷ πόρον σχίσσαντες ἔρετμὰ
λαὰ παρὰ ξανθῆς Ἀρμονίης ὄφιος
ἄστυρον ἐκτίσαντο, τὸ μὲν φυγάδων τις ἐνίσποι
Γραικός, ἀτὰρ κείνων γλῶσσ' ὀνόμηνε Πόλας.

seems to place the tomb of Harmonia at the spot where the city of Pola was afterwards founded, i.e. in the country of the Istrii (Strab. 216). The historian Phylarchus stated that the tomb was near a place called Κύλικες: Athen. xi. 462 b πολλοῖς δὲ καὶ ὁ ἐν Ἰλλυρίῳ τόπος διάβητός ἐστιν ὁ καλούμενος Κύλικες, παρ' ᾧ ἐστὶ τὸ Κάδμον καὶ Ἀρμονίας μνημεῖον, ὡς ἱστορεῖ Φύλαρχος ἐν τῇ δευτέρᾳ καὶ εἰκοστῇ τῶν ἱστοριῶν.

We see from this the shifting and uncertain character of these legends. The tomb of Cadmus and Harmonia is placed by some in the territory of the Illyrian Enchelees, by others at the Istrian Pola:

Lucan iii. 189

nomine prisco

Encheliae uersi testantes funera Cadmi

and Statius *Th.* iii. 288

indigna parumne

Pertulimus diuæ Veneris quod filia longum
Reptat et Illyricas eiectat uirus in herbas?

both connect the death and transformation of the pair with Illyria, and the etymology

¹ The schol. on Ap. R. iv. 507 expressly places the Enchelees in Illyria, about the Ceraunian mountains.

² What this river was is uncertain. De Mirinont, p. 355 of his translation of A. Rh., says it was either the Rhizon or the Drilon. Bernhardt on Dionys. Perieg. 390 says 'id tantum perspicitur, opinionem uariis opinionibus poetarum ac geographorum exornatam eo peruasisse, ut sepulcra quæ Cadmi Harmoniaque dicerentur in uicinia Drili atque Aoi fluminum reponerentur.'

of Encheleis (*anguilla*) makes it nearly certain that both believed that legend to be connected with this particular tribe.

Scylax, after mentioning the two Illyrian rivers Naron and Arion, places 'the stones of Cadmus and Harmonia' at the distance of half a day's voyage, and next in order the town Buthoe, then the Encheleis close to the river Rhizon. Buthoe was mentioned in a hexameter ascribed to Sophocles³ in the *Etym. M.* 207 Βουθοῖη πόλις τῆς Ἰλλυρίας Σοφοκλῆς ὀνομακλεῖ

Βουθοῖη Δρίλωνος ἐπὶ προχοῇσιν ἐνάσθη.

Scymn. 436

ὑπὲρ δὲ Βρύγους Ἐγγέλειοι λεγόμενοι
οἰκοῦσιν, ὧν ὑπῆρξε καὶ Κάδμος ποτέ.

Paus. ix. 5. Dionys. Perieg. 390-397, Priscian Perieg. 381-389, Avien. D. O. T. 535-550. Steph. Byz. s.v. Καμμανία mentions a river *Cadmus* in the Thesprotian district Cammania, later Cestrinia. The latter name, he says, was from Cestrinus, the son of Helenus: cf. *Aen.* iii.

These passages are enough to prove that the later years of Cadmus and Harmonia were associated by tradition with Illyria. Hyginus shows that Agave, according to some accounts, when driven into exile from Thebes also found a home in Illyria. We should thus be prepared to find other legends of Cadmus and Harmonia, again of their daughter Agave, her husband Echion, and her son Pentheus connected with this part of the world, Illyria and the adjoining regions Chaonia and Thesprotia.⁴

Such a legend is mentioned by Parthenius *περὶ ἐρωτικῶν παθημάτων* xxxii. *fin.* He is there telling a *Chaonian* story. Anthippe, loved by a noble youth, is slain by the king's son Cichyrus with a javelin intended to strike a pard (*πάρδαλις*); Cichyrus, believing he has hit the animal, finds the lover holding his hands over Anthippe's wound, and Anthippe dead. In the distraction of his grief he slips from his horse and falls down a precipice. In honour to his memory the Chaonians raise a wall

³ Hemsterhuis thought this was the grandson of the tragic poet, in one of the *Elegies* ascribed to him by Suidas (Gaisford).

⁴ Scylax *Periopl.* 28 μετὰ δ' Ἰλλυρίους Χάονες. 30 μετὰ δὲ Χαονίαν Θεσπρωτοί. 31 μετὰ δὲ Θεσπρωτίαν Κασσωπία, παρικοῦσι δὲ οὗτοι ἑσπεῖς τὸν Ἀνακτορικὸν κόλπον. If Saumaise and Meineke are right in restoring Steph. Byz. Ἐχίνος πόλις Ἀκαρνανίας Ἐχίνου κτίσμα. Πριάς Ἐχίνου [MSS. Ἐχίον] ἔστω, there were cities which claimed to be founded by Echion as far southward as Acarnania.

round the copse (δρυμός) where the tragic event happened, and call the city Cichyrus. Parthenius then proceeds: φασὶ δὲ τινες τὸν δρυμόν ἐκείνον εἶναι τῆς Ἑχίονος θυγατρὸς Ἠπειροῦ, ἣν μεταναστᾶσαν ἐκ Βοιωτίας βαδίζειν μεθ' Ἀρμονίας καὶ Κῦδμου, φερομένην τὰ Πανθῶς λείψανα, ἀποθανοῦσαν δὲ περὶ τὸν δρυμόν τόνδε ταφῆναι. διὸ καὶ τὴν γῆν Ἠπειρον ἀπὸ ταύτης ὀνομασθῆναι.

In this account we have, if I am not much mistaken, the very legend which the writer of the *Culex* followed. A daughter of Echion carrying the remains of Pentheus migrates from Thebes with Cadmus and Harmonia. She dies in or near 'the copse of Cichyrus' and is there buried. Only the name of this daughter (not wife) of Echion does not agree: she was called Epeiros,¹ not Agave. I say nothing of another seeming point of difference, namely that Parthenius states Epeiros was buried in the copse, whereas in the *Culex* Agave only rested in a grotto of the copse, and was destined afterwards to pay the penalty of murdering her son. For the verse in which this is stated as usually printed rests on mere conjecture, and it is not certain what the author of the poem wrote. But even if that conjecture is accepted, it might not improperly be explained of Agave's subsequent death and burial in the place to which she had consigned the mangled remains of her son. Or, again, accepting the legend as the same in outline, we may admit difference in details. The real point to be emphasized is the arrival (in both accounts) in a plantation of trees, Parthenius' δρυμός, *lucus uirens* of the *Culex*, where it is described at great length (109-156), of a woman bearing the remains of Pentheus, and that woman so intimately associated with the house of Cadmus as to follow him and his wife in their flight from Thebes, and to be called the daughter or wife of Echion.

The locale of Parthenius' story, the town Cichyrus, earlier Ephyre, is in a neighbourhood abounding with associations of the Augustan era. It is only necessary to quote Strabo's description (324); it forms part of his account of Epirus—ἐπειτα ἄκρα Χειμέριον καὶ Γλυκὺς Λιμὴν, εἰς ὃν ἐμβάλλει ὁ Ἀχέρων ποταμός, ῥέων ἐκ τῆς Ἀχαιονσῆας λίμνης καὶ δεχόμενος πλείους ποταμούς, ὥστε καὶ γλυκαίνειν τὸν κόλπον. ῥεῖ δὲ καὶ ὁ Θύαμις πλησίον. ὑπέρεκται δὲ τούτου μὲν τοῦ κόλπου Κίχυρος, ἡ πρότερον Ἐφύρα, πόλις Θεσπρωτῶν· τοῦ δὲ κατὰ Βουθροτῶν ἡ Φονίκη. ἐγγὺς δὲ

τῆς Κιχύρου πολίχνην Βουχέτιον Κασσωπαίων, μικρὸν ὑπὲρ τῆς θαλάσσης ὄν, καὶ Ἑλάτρια καὶ Πανδοσία καὶ Βαρία ἐν μεσογαίᾳ. He then proceeds to mention the Ambracian gulf and Nicopolis, the city built on it by Augustus. In this list the names Thyamis, Buthroton, Cassopaei, are familiar to us from Cicero's letters to Atticus, and the last from Propertius (i. 17, 3); the Ambracian gulf and Nicopolis recall the decisive victory of Octavianus at Actium. At Buthroton Atticus had an estate; another on the banks of the river Thyamis. Cic. *Legg.* ii. 3 *Sed tamen huic amoenitati* (Cicero's villa by the Fibrenus), *quem ex Quinto saepe audio, Thyamis Epirotas tuus ille nihil, opinor, concesserit.* Q. *Est ita, ut dicis: caue enim putes Attici nostri Amalthio platanisque illis quicquam esse praeclarium.* Att. vii. 2 *In Actio Corcyrae Alexio me opipare muneratus est.* Q. *Ciceroni obisti non potuit, quo minus Thyamim uideret.* Cassope is mentioned *Fam.* xvi. 9, 1.

There was also in this neighbourhood a traditional Troy. This is recorded at length by Vergil *Aen.* iii. 302. He states that Helenus, who after the death of Neoptolemus had married Andromache and succeeded Neoptolemus in the sovereignty of the Epirots near Buthroton, called the district Chaonia from a Trojan named Chaon and built a town called Troy. Servius on iii. 349 says that this statement was confirmed by Varro, who had personally visited the spot and found all the names recorded by Vergil; and this same authority is said to have specialized a site called *Castra Troiana* at the place where the Trojan fleet waited for the arrival of Aeneas. Similarly Dionysius of Halicarnassus *Antiqq.* i. 51 says 'the presence of the Trojans at Buthroton is indicated by a hill, which they used at that time as a camp, called Troy': and he mentions a harbour which originally bore the name of Anchises but had been transmuted in the course of time to *Onchesmus* (Anchiasmus),² cf. Seeley *Liv.* i. Steph. Byz. informs us that this Troy was in the district called *Cestria*: and this, as we have seen, was traditionally associated with Cestrinus, son of Helenus, son of Priam (Steph. B. *s.v.* Καρμανία. Paus. i. 11). In Thucydides' time the river Thyamis formed the boundary between Thesprotis and Cestrine (i. 46).

So far the topographical surroundings of

² The name of this town will recur to every reader of Cicero, *flavit ab Epiro lenissimus Onchesmites*, Att. vii. 2.

¹ Or, as Le Grand suggested, Epeiro.

the Cichyean *δρυμὸς* are such as to suit a poem inscribed to Octavius. He had himself as a youth spent six months in Apollonia, at the mouth of the Aous and near the Acroceraunian mountains: this was shortly before the death of his uncle the dictator in 44 B.C. Velleius tells us (ii. 59) that he was sent there to be educated and to study: and it might naturally form part of his training to visit such places in the vicinity as legend literature or natural features had made interesting.¹

There is however a particular point connected with the town of Ephyra or Cichyrus which appears to me to make the identification of Parthenius' story with the narrative of the *Culex* almost certain. Not only was it surrounded with places or names specially belonging to the infernal world, but there was a very ancient tradition of a *νεκυομαντεῖον* or oracle of the dead in the district to which it belonged. The two points must be taken separately.

(1) Thucydides i. 46 after mentioning Ephyra as in the Thesprotian Elaeatis adds *ἐξείσι δὲ παρ' αὐτὴν Ἀχερουσία λίμνη ἐς θάλασσαν· διὰ δὲ τῆς Θεσπρωτίδος Ἀχέρων ποταμὸς ῥέων ἐσβάλλει ἐς αὐτήν, ἀφ' οὗ καὶ τὴν ἑπωνυμίαν ἔχει*. Here we have two names, both associated with the lower world—the river Acheron and the Acherusian marsh. These are both historically famous in connexion with the death of the Epirot king Alexander. The Dodonaean oracle had warned him in the words of Livy (viii. 24) *ut quam maxime procul abesset urbe Pandosia in Epiro et Acheronte amni quem ex Molosside fluentem in stagna inferna accipit Thesprotius sinus*. Alexander, fearing his end from the Epirotic Pandosia and Acheron, found it in

the similarly named Pandosia and Acheron of Lucania. Cf. Justin xii. 2. Scylax § 30 includes the harbour Elaea, the Acheron, and the Acherusian marsh in the territory of the Thesproti, in immediate juxtaposition to the Cassopaei. Pausanias (i. 17, 5) places the Acheron and Acherusian marsh near Cichyrus (*πρὸς τῇ Κιχύρῳ*), and adds a third name associated with the underworld, the Cocytus, which he calls 'a most unpleasant water' (*ὄδωρ ἀρεπτότατον*). The two river-names he believed to have been transferred by Homer to the other world from actual inspection of their Thesprotian homonyms: the very name of the white-poplar (*ἀχρωῖς*) was given by Homer from the Thesprotian Acheron where Heracles had seen it growing.

(2) There was also in the same Thesprotian region somewhere on the banks of the Acheron a *νεκυομαντεῖον*. This we know from Herodotus, who states that Periander, tyrant of Corinth, having sent messengers to the *νεκυομαντεῖον* there to obtain advice about a deposit entrusted to him by a friend, the ghost of his wife Melissa appeared. With this oracle of the dead, perhaps some chasm in the ground from which the spirits of the dead were supposed to appear on summons, one of the legends about *Orpheus* was associated. Paus. ix. 30, 6 'Others say *Orpheus*' wife having died before him, he came for love of her (*δι' αὐτήν*) to the Aornon in Thesprotia, as in old times there was an oracle of the dead there: and believing that *Eurydice's* soul was following him, and having lost her (or, committed a mistake) in turning round, killed himself with his own hand for grief.' This *Ἀορνὸν τὸ ἐν τῇ Θεσπρωτίᾳ* is probably the *locus Aornos et pestifera avibus exalatio* of Plin. iv. 2.

I need not say how greatly these two points bear upon the *Culex*. The chief difficulty which that poem presents is to account for the disproportionately long description of the lower world, and the quaint conception of the gnat's ghost returning from thence to tell the sleeping shepherd what it had seen there. This narrative takes up no less than 165 vv. (210–375) out of a total of 414. If the legendary Agave-grove (*Cul.* 109) where the sleeping shepherd, in danger of being killed by a serpent, is roused by a gnat, which gnat he kills and then sees in a dream recounting the life of the shades in Tartarus and Elysium—if this grove, I say, was none other than the *δρυμὸς* at Cichyrus to which Echion's daughter brought the

¹ Because Appian *B.C.* iii. 9 states that the studies of Octavius at Apollonia were mainly in war, it does not follow that he did nothing else. We know that he attended Apollodorus of Pergamus as a pupil in rhetoric (Strab. 525, Suet. *Aug.* 89), having taken him to Apollonia for the purpose; and Plutarch (*Brut.* 23) says *ἐν Ἀπολλωνίᾳ διέτριβεν σχολάζων περὶ λόγους*. The anecdote mentioned by Sueton. *Oct.* 94 proves that he did not disdain to show an interest in astrology; the connexion of which pretended science with his life and destiny is often emphasized by Suetonius, Manilius and others. See Gardthausen *Augustus und seine Zeit* ii. p. 22, and on Augustus' horoscope pp. 16 sqq. and the valuable dissertation of Weichert *de Augusti scriptis eorumque reliquiis* 1835. Dion expressly tells us Octavius was trained (*ἡσκεῖτο*) in Greek rhetoric (45, 2), and we may feel sure, from his interest in literature, and his own writings, that he did not neglect Greek poetry. This is indeed stated by Suetonius 89 *ne Graecarum quidem disciplinarum leuiore studio tenebatur: again, eruditione etiam varia repletus est per Aerei philosophi filiorumque eius Dionysii et Nicanoris contubernium*.

remains of Pentheus as recounted by Parthenius (xxxii. *fin.*), we can see how the Roman poet was led to his outline, and can even account for many of his details. The old legend of the *vekvo-μavtiov* is in his thoughts when he describes the *effigies*¹ of the gnat, sad from its recent death and its visit to Tartarus, appearing in sleep to its murderer and reproaching him with his ingratitude:

Cuius ut intrauit lenior per corpora somnus
Languidaque effuso requierunt membra
sopore,
Effigies ad eum culicis deuenit et illi
Tristis ab euentu cecinit conuicia mortis.

The old associations of the Acheron, the Acherusian marsh, the Cocytus suggest Tartarus with all its familiar horrors, Charon, Tisiphone, Cerberus, the punishments of legendary transgressors, Otus and Ephialtes, Tityos, Tantalus, Sisyphus, the Danaides, Medea; the woeful shades of Procne and Philomela, of Eteocles and Polynices; again the happier ghosts of Alcestis and Penelope; then Eurydice and Orpheus.

On this particular legend the poet dwells at unusual length (268–294), consecrating to it no less than twenty-six verses; and we can understand why he does so. One version of the Orpheus legend was specially located at the Thesprotian Aornon and its oracle, as Pausanias tells us. If the poet describes at length the tragic story of Eurydice almost regained and then lost for ever by her husband's looking back involuntarily, it is because this recovery from death and final loss had a local habitation in the near neighbourhood of the Cichyrean grove.²

Again, it seems probable that the grove pictured in the *Culex* was to some extent painted from an actual plantation of Chaonian trees. Something of the kind may account for the special introduction of two verses in themselves not very relevant, 136, 7:

Quam comitabantur fatalia carmina quercus,
Quercus ante datae Cereris quam semina
uitae,
Illas Triptolemi mutauit sulcus aristas.

¹ Cf. Henry *Aeneidea* ii. 394 (on *Aen.* iii. 148).

² It is remarkable that Pausanias mentions among the various legends of Orpheus one in which a shepherd while asleep at midday, with his body turned toward Orpheus' tomb, suddenly breaks into song, singing, whilst still asleep, verses of Orpheus (ix. 30, 16).

It is not merely that oaks are specially connected with Epirus and Dodona, but that Vergil (either himself the poet of the *Culex*, or imitated by the poet), in the well-known passage where he speaks of mankind changing acorns for wheat, specializes the acorn as Chaonian, *G. i. 8 Chaoniam pingui glandem mutauit arista*.

We have already seen that the white-poplar grew so freely on the banks of the Acheron, that Pausanias drew from thence the etymology of its Greek name *ἀχερωίς*. Now the writer of the *Culex* not only mentions this tree second in his description (127–130), but dwells particularly on the whiteness of its foliage:

Candida fundebant tentis uelamina ramis.

Again the plane-tree, which the poet places first in his list of trees:

Nam primum prona surgebant ualle
patentes
Aeriae platanus—

is the very tree which gave its charm to Atticus' villa on the banks of the Thyamis (*Legg.* ii. 3).³

Oudin (*Dissertation Critique sur le Culex*, 1729⁴) was the first who called attention to a seeming discrepancy between the *Culex* we have and the abstract of it given in the Life of Vergil ascribed to Donatus. In the poem the shepherd falls asleep by a spring (*ad fontem requieuit* 157), in the Life the serpent comes from a marsh (*proreperet a palude*). It might be said that a marsh seems implied by the words describing the gnat (183 *paruulus umoris alumnus*), or by the croaking of the frogs (151), and that it was from this that the writer of the Life drew. But, whether the poet had in his mind a spring alone, or a marsh adjoining also, it is obvious that the Cichyrean copse, in the close neighbourhood of the Acherusian marsh, would fall in with his somewhat indeterminate language. If indeed

³ Leake, *Travels in Northern Greece* i. p. 241, describing a gorge in the neighbourhood of the Acheron, specially mentions the holm-oak, ilex, and pine: 'On either side rise perpendicular rocks, in the midst of which are little intervals of scanty soil, bearing holly-oaks, ilices, and other shrubs, and which admit occasionally a view of the higher summits of the two mountains (Suli and Tztkurates) covered with oaks, and at the summit of all pines.' P. 243 he notices the 'fine planes' near Luro.

⁴ As this learned Jesuit's dissertation is now nearly forgotten, I may refer my readers to it more exactly. It is in *Continuation des Mémoires de Littérature et d'Histoire* vol. vii. pp. 295–323.

the writer of the Life had seen some early commentary on the *Culex*, in which the δρυμὸς by the Acheron was named as the scene of the poem, his abstract might have been based partly on this, and he might substitute the marsh for the spring from his combined recollections.

It may seem fanciful to add that the very name of the *Culex* may have been suggested by a local association. The historian Phylarchus mentioned as a name given to the Illyrian burial-place of Cadmus and Harmonia the Greek plural Κύλικες. The difference in meaning would not much affect the question. Nor does it seem improbable that the introduction of a *snake* as a chief actor in the little drama of the Gnat is assignable to the Cadmus-myth. Cadmus slew the serpent that guarded the waters of Dirce, and from that serpent's teeth sprang the Sparti, one of whom was Echion, the husband of Agave (ἔχων). Cadmus and Harmonia settle among the *Encheleis*, are metamorphosed into snakes¹ and lead, in snake-form, an Illyrian army into Hellas (*Bacch.* 1355-8). Another account (schol. *Pyth.* iii. 153) states that they were conveyed to Elysium in a chariot drawn by serpents.

The Life of Vergil ascribed to Donatus states that he wrote the *Culex* at the age of sixteen, i.e. in 54 B.C. If he really wrote it and at that age, he must have drawn his knowledge of the Agave-legend in vv. 110-114 from some Greek collection of stories similar to that published later by Parthenius. If, on the other hand, as Oudin and Ribbeck agree, the language of Suetonius (*Vita Lucani* p. 50 Reyfferscheid) and Statius (*S.* ii. 7, 73) makes it probable that xvi. is a mistake for xxvi., Vergil, as we are nowhere informed of his visiting Epirus, may have selected the time (45 B.C.) when young Octavius was [redacted] to dedicate to him a poem on a subject suggested by the adjacent country, partly based, we might suppose, on materials supplied by some friend in the retinue of Octavius² who had seen Cichyrus and its δρυμὸς with his own eyes. The strong language *Octavi uenerande* 25, and again *Sancite puer* 26 and 37, must, I think, be meant for the one Octavius to whom those

epithets could alone suitably belong, the nephew of the dictator C. Julius Caesar.

There is however, to my mind, a fulness and minuteness in the description not only of the grove (109-156) but of the surrounding country, alternately cliff and valley, abounding in forest-trees and shrubs, as well as falling spontaneously into grottos or caverns (46-98), and at all times the natural haunt of goats,³ which implies that the poet had seen it in person. We might then suppose that the [author (in this case not Vergil), in attendance on Octavius at Apollonia, used the occasion to visit the legendary places near, among these the Acheron, with its marsh, and the town of Cichyrus which adjoined it. At Cichyrus he was shown a grove to which a mythological tradition attached. It had given a temporary refuge to Cadmus and Harmonia when with a female of their house, whether wife or daughter of Echion, they had fled from Thebes as exiles, carrying with them the remains of the mangled Pentheus. The legend, located as it was in the wild and picturesque scenery of the Acheron, struck his fancy: starting from it as a basis, he first sketched the grove itself with its trees, spring, cicadas, and croaking frogs; next the ground adjoining, now rock, now glen, with the goats that hung from its cliffs, snuffed the gale under its shrubs, or viewed their image reflected in its waters. Then he worked in the other associations of the place: Acheron and Coeetus suggested their homonyms in the world below; the historic oracle of the dead near the Acheron and its connexion with the tragic story of Orpheus and Eurydice determined the introduction of this story in the poem, and the appearance of the Gnat's ghost in a dream as the medium through which the picture of Tartarus and Elysium was to be presented. The Gnat itself, the only grotesque element in the poem, might be a reminiscence of the legendary Κύλικες, a name associated with the tomb of Cadmus and Harmonia, if this Illyrian tradition was not too special to be widely known.

On this view the *Culex* was written 45-44 B.C. when Octavius, who was born on Sept. 23 B.C. 63, was eighteen or nineteen years old. The words 'revered Octavius' and 'divine boy' would therefore be strictly correct.

³ Leake, *North. Greece* i. 243. 'The river (Acheron) in the pass is deep and rapid, and is seen at the bottom falling in many places in cascades over the rocks, though at too great a distance to be heard, and in most places inaccessible to any but the foot of a goat or a Suliote.'

¹ Nicander introduces the pair in his *Theriaca* 607 Ἴριον θ' ἦν ἰθρεψε Δρίλων καὶ Νάρωνος ὄχθαι, Σιδονίου Κάδμοιο θεμελίον Ἀρμονίης τε Ἐνθα δύο δασ-πλήτε νόμον στείβουσιν δράκοντες.

² Appian calls him μετράκιον whilst he was at Apollonia, *B.C.* iii. 9 Μετράκιον δὲ ἔτι ὦν ἐς Ἀπολλωνίαν τὴν ἐπὶ τοῦ Ἰονίου, παιδεύεσθαι τε καὶ ἀσκεῖσθαι τὰ πολέμια ἐπέμπετο ὑπὸ τοῦ Καίσαρος.

If, however, with most critics we trace in the *Culex* no less than three imitations more or less direct of Vergil (1) the happiness of the shepherd's life, based on *G. ii.* 458-540 (2) the episode of Orpheus and Eurydice, partially modelled on *G. iv.* 453-527 (3) the description of the infernal regions with its many resemblances to *Aen. vi.*, we shall find in the battle of Actium (B.C. 31) another and later period in the life of Octavianus from which the conception of the poem might date. From that time forward Actium and its new city Nicopolis became so famous as to draw visitors from every part of the world, and to give a new interest to the history and traditions of its neighbourhood. Some such visitor, familiar with the *Georgics*, perhaps (but not certainly) with the *Aeneid*,—or again some chance settler in this district of Epirus, not impossibly a Greek trained in the language and poetry of Rome,—may have planned an epyllion imitating the style and ideas of Vergil. Into this he worked two of the most famous episodes in the *Georgics*, the happiness of a country life

and the story of Orpheus and Eurydice. The local legends lent themselves to his plan, and he fixed the scene of his Vergilian epyllion in the Agave-grove on the banks of the Acheron—the same Acheron from whence Orpheus had, as tradition told, nearly regained his Eurydice. The story once written, it remained to add a look of genuineness by dedicating the poem to the man who as Octavius had been Vergil's early patron, and was now as Augustus master of the Roman world. The introduction of Octavius' name and the predominance of Vergilian *motifs* in the poem would combine with the real merits of the workmanship to give it circulation, and eventually to make it thought an actual work of Vergil's youth. As the *Georgics* seem to have been published not earlier than 29 B.C. the genesis of the poem would then be subsequent to this year; if the description of the lower world was modelled on *Aen. vi.* (which I doubt), not till after 19 B.C. in which year Vergil died.

ROBINSON ELLIS.

THE LATIN PASSIVE INFINITIVE IN *-IER*: *INFITIAS IRE*.

It were venturesome to add another to the existing explanations of the Latin infin. pass. in *-ier*, but I can, I believe, give increased cogency to one of them (cf. Stolz, *Lat. Gram.*² § 117).

The Roman grammarians distinctly chronicle for us such forms as *biber* for *bibere* (cf. Charisius in Keil, *Gram. L.* i. 124), and these belonged to an early period. The manuscripts of Plautus record *vider* for *videre* (*Epid.* 62, cf. the author in *Am. Jr. Phil.* xv. 372), and *dicer* is claimed on metrical grounds at *Merc.* 282 (cf. Sonnenschein, *Transac. Am. Phil. Assoc.* 1893, 14). Now Stolz would see in *agier* a contamination of *agi* and *ager*. I propose instead to take the *-ie-* verbs as a starting-point, and so explain *de-ripiér* (*Men.* 1006) as an abbreviated infin. to a *-ie-* stem. Thus *-ripiér* and *rapere* would belong, the first to a *-ie-* stem, the second to an *-e-* stem. It is common enough in Sanskrit for a root to have both *-ya-* and *-a-* present-systems, and this state of things appears in Latin also, at least with the verb *venio* (cf. Brix, *Trin.*⁴ 41).

The assignment of exclusive passive value

to the *-ier* forms—I say assignment because the infin. was originally either active or passive (cf. the author, *Am. Jr. Phil.* xv. 221)—was almost inevitable, because a final *-r* characterized the passive. The deponents also lent a hand, for they were all possessed of both active and passive infin. forms, the former being finally reserved for the impv. Plautus has *egredier* (*Poen.* 742) as an infin., for *-ier* had been abstracted from *egredier* as an infin. ending.

In the passage of certain *-ie-* stems into the fourth conjugation we have perhaps a proof of the assumed fullest form in *-iere*. Thus *venire* may be explained from **veniēre*, with contraction as in *fili* (<*filie*?) and *audi* (<*audie*—*audite* <*audiete*?). The preservation of *-ier* instead of *-ir* would be due to a conscious adaptation of *-ier* to the value of a pass. infin. suffix at a period prior to the contraction *ie>i*. Thus the original forms *ripiér* and *rapi* gave rise to the type *laudariér* || *laudari*. It must be borne in mind that all analogical extensions imply consciousness on the part of the language users, and so interfere with normal phonetic development.

I have suggested (*Am. Jr. Phil.* xv. 366) that the so-called contracted forms of which *ama-sse* is typical were pre-rhotacistic presents in *-se* restrained from normal phonetic development in archaic legal formulas with *volo*, and subsequently interpreted, after the analogy of *fuisse*, as perfects. There is still another step in the analogy thus: *dixē*: *dicti*=*fuisse*: *fuisti*=*amā(s)se*: *amāsti*.

This explanation may be applied to *infitias ire* 'to deny,' regarding *infitias* as an elided form of **infitiasē* (archaic pres. infin.) in dependence upon *ire*, a construction fairly common in Plautus (Brix, *Trin.*⁴ 1015). I find it hard to believe that *infitias* is acc. plur. in a terminal sense, being, as it is, an abstract noun. The same objection holds against *suppetias ire* 'go to the help of,' and *exsequias ire* 'go to the burial of,' which last however is also explained as cognate

accus., an explanation that does not seem to me probable, for no Roman ever said, I fancy, *funus ire* 'go (to) a funeral.' Neither *venum ire* 'be sold,' nor *pessum ire* 'go down' (to sink), seem to me parallel cases: for *venum*, if not an infin. in *-om*, such as we have in Oscan-Umbrian, may mean some concrete thing like 'market,' and be modelled on *domum ire*, as *foras ire* is; while *pessum* is probably supine to *pet* 'fall.' As to *malam crucem ire* (Brix on *Capt.* 469) for the usual *in malam*, etc., this may be a comic contrast modelled on *domum* 'home' beside *in domum* 'to the house,' implying that *malam crucem* is the customary habitation of the person berated.

It seems to me worthy of note that beside *suppetias*, *infitias*, *exsequias ire* we have deponent infinitives *infitiari*, etc.

EDWIN W. FAX.

Lexington, Va.

ARISTOTLE'S CLASSIFICATION OF THE ARTS OF ACQUISITION.

IN a careful paper entitled 'Aristotle's doctrine of Barter,' which appeared in the *Harvard Quarterly Journal of Economics*, April 1895, Professor Ashley has called attention to the difficulties which he and others find in a passage of Aristotle's *Politics* (Bk. i. 1258^b 27 sqq.), about the τρίτον εἶδος χρηματιστικῆς, and has endeavoured to determine what kind of classification is really intended by Aristotle. The passage is as follows:—

τρίτον δὲ εἶδος χρηματιστικῆς μεταξὺ ταύτης καὶ τῆς πρώτης (ἔχει γὰρ καὶ τῆς κατὰ φύσιν τι μέρος καὶ τῆς μεταβλητικῆς), ὅσα ἀπὸ γῆς καὶ τῶν ἀπὸ γῆς γινομένων ἀκαρπῶν μὲν χρησίμων δέ, οἷον ὕλοτομία τε καὶ πᾶσα μεταλλευτική.

The syntax of this has been pronounced almost desperate; ὅσα is supposed to be without any regular grammatical construction; and the text has been suspected by more than one critic. Bernays e.g. conjectured οὕσα for ὅσα.

One must venture to think that the text is sound and the syntax correct. The construction is a familiar one in Aristotle, and the difficulties are due to slips of translation in which by some ill luck even distinguished scholars have been involved. The origin of the mistake is the translation of ὅσα ἀπὸ γῆς by 'products of the soil (or

earth),' which of course leaves ὅσα without construction. The rendering is natural enough, but ought to have been questioned because of difficulties in the remainder of the sentence, which however have been overlooked. τῶν ἀπὸ γῆς γινομένων would also mean products of the earth, and if the construction of these genitives is after ὅσα (ὅσα ἀπὸ γῆς καὶ ὅσα τῶν ἀπὸ γῆς γινομένων), there results an illogical statement, in which the species is added to the genus—'products of the soil, and products of the soil, not fruits though useful.' If the construction is (as it really is) ὅσα ἀπὸ γῆς καὶ ὅσα ἀπὸ τῶν ἀπὸ γῆς γινομένων, the distinction would be between direct products of the soil, and things derived from or made from products of the soil which are not fruits. This again is hardly possible, because firstly, the examples given are not of the manufacture of raw products, but of the acquisition of them—mining (μεταλλευτική) and not e.g. χαλουργική, woodcutting (ὕλοτομία) and not e.g. τεκτονική. Secondly, the classification would be incomplete, because the species of product with which ὕλοτομία and μεταλλευτική are concerned, i.e. things which are useful but not fruits, is not named. If it be replied that it is included implicitly in the generic term ὅσα ἀπὸ γῆς, because the division of this into κάρπια and ἀκαρπα is implied in the mention of commodities made from the

latter, it is odd that this should not be made clear by examples of both species of the division.

Further, if *ὅσα ἀπὸ γῆς* include useful products both edible and inedible, then since the classification recognizes articles made from the latter (*ἀπὸ τῶν κ.τ.λ.*), it ought also to recognize articles made from the former, *e.g.* bread from corn. In fact, whereas a fourfold division ought to have been made—(1) edible products of the soil, (2) inedible though useful products of the soil, (3) articles made from the first, (4) articles made from the second, the third species would not be mentioned at all, instead of the first two we should have the corresponding genus without indication of its division into the two species, and finally the examples would illustrate one species only of the four, and that too one which is not named in the classification which is made.

Though Aristotle is not so infallible in analysis as interpreters may sometimes think, he is not likely to have been so illogical as this; and at any rate an explanation of the text which makes the classification logical and the examples adequate will have the advantage.

Another serious difficulty is caused by the fact that *ὅσα ἀπὸ γῆς* is taken to include 'fruits.' This is quite necessary in a context which mentions products of the earth which are not fruits, supposing *ὅσα ἀπὸ γῆς* means 'products of the earth' at all.

But the form of *κτητική* or *χρηματιστική* which has to do with the fruits of the earth is *γεωργία*, and this is included in the *πρῶτον εἶδος κτητικῆς*, that *κατὰ φύσιν* and concerned with *τροφή*, from which the *τρίτον εἶδος* is expressly distinguished in the passage before us.

To get over this, it has been supposed that the *τρίτον εἶδος* does not mean the direct acquisition of the *ὅσα ἀπὸ γῆς κ.τ.λ.* from nature, but the barter of them. This is obviously untenable. For, (1) the examples, *ἰλοτομία* and *μεταλλευτική*, are not examples of exchange, but of direct acquisition from nature. (2) If Aristotle meant the *τρίτον εἶδος* to be barter, it would be easy to say so, and it is incredible that he should not; yet there is not a hint in the text to this effect. (3) Aristotle here actually distinguishes the *τρίτον εἶδος* from exchange (*μεταβλητική*, the second kind of *χρηματιστική*). It is true *μεταβλητική*, the generic term, is here used for a species, the 'unnatural' *μεταβλητική*; but then, if the *τρίτον εἶδος* distinguished from it were

itself a kind of *μεταβλητική*, it would be all the more necessary to say this expressly.

It is the syntax which really gives the key to the solution of these difficulties. *τρίτον εἶδος... ὅσα* corresponds to a regular formula for enumerating the species of a genus. A clause beginning with *ὅσοι*, *ὅσα*, etc., gives the species and is grammatically either a predicate of the *γένος* or *εἶδος*, or else in apposition to the phrase which expresses it. Consequently *ὅσα* would refer to the various species of this third kind of acquisition, that is to *industries* and not to commodities. This is entirely borne out by the examples introduced by *οἶον*, for they are examples of *industries*, *ἰλοτομία* and *μεταλλευτική*. The construction of *ἀπὸ* is that which is usual after *χρηματιστική* and similar expressions to denote the source of profit. Cf. *Pol.* 1258^a 37, *χρηματιστική ἀπὸ τῶν καρπῶν καὶ τῶν ζώων*; 1258^b 1, *οὐ κατὰ φύσιν (ἢ μεταβλητικῇ χρηματιστικῇ) ἀλλ' ἀπ' ἀλλήλων*; 1258^b 14 *ἐχρηματίζοντο ἀπὸ τῶν κοινῶν*; *Soph. Elench.* 171^b 27-29, *ἡ γὰρ σοφιστικὴ ἐστίν... χρηματιστικὴ τις ἀπὸ σοφίας φαινομένης*.

Thus *ὅσα ἀπὸ γῆς* means 'industries depending upon earth' (lit. 'in which the profit is made from earth'), and *ὅσα ἀπὸ τῶν ἀπὸ γῆς γινόμενων ἀκάρπων μὲν χρησίμων* δέ, industries depending upon a particular kind of *γινόμενα ἀπὸ γῆς*.

The opposition is between *γῆ* as minerals in general and *γινόμενα ἀπὸ γῆς*, things which grow from the earth. Of the latter, the *χρήσιμα* are either *κάριμα* or *ἀκαρπα*, and of these two the last only comes here into consideration, because the first of them belongs to the industries of the *πρῶτον εἶδος*.

ὅσα ἀπὸ γῆς then represents mineral industries, and of these *μεταλλευτική* is the example: *ὅσα ἀπὸ τῶν ἀπὸ γῆς γινόμενων ἀκάρπων μὲν χρησίμων* δέ means industries in which are acquired useful things which grow from the earth but are not edible, for instance timber, and of these *ἰλοτομία* is the example.

It must be noticed that in both cases the commodities are got directly from nature.

This interpretation is in accordance with a general sense of *γῆ* found in Aristotle, and its correctness seems proved by the following passage from the *Economics* 1343^a 25, *κατὰ φύσιν δὲ γεωργικῇ προτέρα, καὶ δευτέρα ὅσαι ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς, οἷον μεταλλευτικὴ καὶ εἰ τις ἄλλη τοιαύτη*; where on the one hand *γεωργικὴ* is distinguished from the industries which are *ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς*, and on the other hand *μεταλλευτικὴ* is given as an example of them.

This last passage may suggest the emendation $\delta\sigma\alpha\iota\ \dot{\alpha}\pi\acute{o}\ \gamma\eta\varsigma$ in the *Politics*, but no change is necessary, and the neuter may stand. Cf. e.g. 1258^b 23, $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \tau\alpha\upsilon\tau\eta\varsigma\ \mu\acute{\epsilon}\rho\eta\ \tau\rho\acute{\iota}\alpha, \nu\alpha\upsilon\kappa\lambda\eta\rho\acute{\iota}\alpha\ \phi\omicron\rho\tau\eta\gamma\acute{\iota}\alpha\ \pi\alpha\rho\acute{\alpha}\sigma\tau\alpha\iota\varsigma$; διαφέρει δέ τούτων ἕτερα ἑτέρων τῷ τὰ μὲν ἀσφαλέστερα εἶναι, τὰ δὲ πλείω πορίζειν τὴν ἐπικαρπίαν, where the neuters in the last clause are not likely to be in agreement with $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\rho\eta$.

The passage may therefore be rendered:—
'A third kind of acquisition of commodities lying between the second and the first (for it has something in common with natural acquisition and with exchange) consists of those industries which depend on minerals and those which depend on inedible but useful products of the soil, for instance, woodcutting and every form of mining.'

Or, possibly, 'a third kind of acquisition lies between these two etc., consisting of those industries etc.'

The distinction of the three kinds of acquisition ($\kappa\tau\eta\tau\acute{\iota}\kappa\eta$ or $\chi\rho\eta\mu\alpha\tau\iota\sigma\tau\acute{\iota}\kappa\eta$) is as follows:—

The first kind ($\dot{\epsilon}\nu\ \epsilon\acute{\iota}\delta\omicron\varsigma\ \kappa\tau\eta\tau\acute{\iota}\kappa\eta\varsigma\ \kappa\alpha\tau\grave{\alpha}\ \phi\acute{\upsilon}\sigma\iota\nu\ \mu\acute{\epsilon}\rho\omicron\varsigma\ \tau\eta\varsigma\ \omicron\iota\kappa\omicron\nu\omicron\mu\omicron\kappa\eta\varsigma$ 1256^b 27) is the acquisition from nature of products fit for food ($\dot{\alpha}\pi\acute{o}\ \tau\omicron\nu\nu\ \kappa\alpha\rho\phi\omega\nu\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \tau\omicron\nu\nu\ \zeta\omega\omega\nu$ 1258^a 37), to which is to be added, as will be seen presently, simple barter of these things for one another, which is the good $\mu\epsilon\tau\alpha\beta\lambda\eta\tau\acute{\iota}\kappa\eta$. The second kind is trade in general, $\kappa\alpha\tau\eta\lambda\iota\kappa\eta$ (1258^a 39 etc.) = $\mu\epsilon\tau\alpha\beta\lambda\eta\tau\acute{\iota}\kappa\eta$ in the narrower sense = $\chi\rho\eta\mu\alpha\tau\iota\sigma\tau\acute{\iota}\kappa\eta$ in the narrower sense (1256^b 40), in which Aristotle thinks men get their profit not out of nature but out of one another and so unnaturally (1258^b 1-2, $\omicron\upsilon\ \kappa\alpha\tau\grave{\alpha}\ \phi\acute{\upsilon}\sigma\iota\nu\ \dot{\alpha}\lambda\lambda'\ \dot{\alpha}\pi'\ \dot{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\eta\lambda\omega\nu$).

The $\tau\rho\acute{\iota}\tau\omicron\nu\ \epsilon\acute{\iota}\delta\omicron\varsigma$ is, like the first, the acquisition from nature of useful products, but the products are not edible.

The text shows plainly that this is what Aristotle intends, but doubts have arisen as to what he precisely means by saying that the $\tau\rho\acute{\iota}\tau\omicron\nu\ \epsilon\acute{\iota}\delta\omicron\varsigma$ comes between the other two and has something in common with both— $\tau\rho\acute{\iota}\tau\omicron\nu\ \delta\epsilon\ \epsilon\acute{\iota}\delta\omicron\varsigma\ \chi\rho\eta\mu\alpha\tau\iota\sigma\tau\acute{\iota}\kappa\eta\varsigma\ \mu\epsilon\tau\alpha\zeta\dot{\upsilon}\ \tau\alpha\upsilon\tau\eta\varsigma\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \tau\eta\varsigma\ \pi\rho\acute{\omega}\tau\eta\varsigma$, ἔχει γὰρ καὶ τῆς κατὰ φύσιν τι μέρος καὶ τῆς μεταβλητικῆς. The text contains no explanation of this statement.

The affinity of the first and third kinds is clear, as in both the source of profit is the natural product. But what has the third in common with the second? The answer must be looked for in the points in which they severally differ from the first.

The characteristic of the second kind as compared with the first lies, as has been

said, in a certain unnaturalness in the profit. The gain is $\dot{\alpha}\pi'\ \dot{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\eta\lambda\omega\nu$; the meaning of which seems to be that the middlemen or tradesmen, including usurers, are conceived as getting what they get from others, without giving an equivalent for it in the shape of a commodity ($\chi\rho\eta\sigma\acute{\iota}\mu\omicron\nu$).

The distinction between the third kind and the first, as indicated by the words $\dot{\alpha}\kappa\acute{\alpha}\rho\pi\omega\nu\ \mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\ \chi\rho\eta\sigma\acute{\iota}\mu\omicron\nu\ \delta\acute{\epsilon}$, is that the commodities of the third kind are not consumable, not $\tau\rho\omicron\phi\acute{\eta}$, like those of the first kind, but such as wood and minerals. Now Aristotle may have thought that though such things were $\chi\rho\eta\sigma\acute{\iota}\mu\alpha$ they were less naturally so than articles of food, as these are the immediate support of human life while minerals and the like are not. This would be in the spirit of what he says about the connection of $\phi\acute{\upsilon}\sigma\iota\varsigma$ and $\tau\rho\omicron\phi\acute{\eta}$: e.g. 1256^b 7, $\eta\ \mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\ \omicron\upsilon\nu\ \tau\omicron\iota\alpha\upsilon\tau\eta\ \kappa\tau\eta\sigma\iota\varsigma$ (i.e. of edibles) $\dot{\epsilon}\pi'$ αὐτῆς φαίνεται τῆς φύσεως δεδομένη πᾶσιν, ὥσπερ κατὰ τὴν πρῶτην γένεσιν εὐθὺς οὕτω καὶ τελειοθεῖσιν. See the rest of the passage and compare 1258^a 35, $\phi\acute{\upsilon}\sigma\epsilon\omega\varsigma\ \gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho\ \dot{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\iota\nu\ \dot{\epsilon}\rho\gamma\omicron\nu\ \tau\rho\omicron\phi\acute{\eta}\nu\ \tau\omega\ \gamma\epsilon\gamma\iota\nu\eta\theta\acute{\epsilon}\nu\tau\iota\ \pi\alpha\rho\acute{\epsilon}\chi\epsilon\iota\nu\ \pi\alpha\nu\tau\acute{\iota}\ \gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho\ \dot{\epsilon}\zeta\ \omicron\upsilon\ \gamma\acute{\iota}\nu\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota\ \tau\rho\omicron\phi\acute{\eta}\ \tau\omicron\ \lambda\epsilon\iota\phi\acute{o}\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\nu\ \dot{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\acute{\iota}\nu$. διὸ κατὰ φύσιν ἐστὶν ἡ χρηματιστικὴ πᾶσιν ἀπὸ τῶν καρπῶν καὶ τῶν ζώων. Compare also the epitome of these passages in *Economies* 1343^a 30, $\dot{\epsilon}\tau\iota\ \delta\acute{\epsilon}\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \tau\omicron\nu\nu\ \kappa\alpha\tau\grave{\alpha}\ \phi\acute{\upsilon}\sigma\iota\nu\ (\eta\ \gamma\epsilon\omega\rho\gamma\iota\kappa\acute{\eta})$. φύσει γὰρ ἀπὸ τῆς μητρὸς ἡ τροφή πᾶσιν ἐστίν, ὥστε καὶ τοῖς ἀνθρώποις ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς.

The inferior 'naturalness' therefore of the source of profit in the $\tau\rho\acute{\iota}\tau\omicron\nu\ \epsilon\acute{\iota}\delta\omicron\varsigma$ may constitute the affinity of this class to the second.

Again, the wealth which is the object of the second kind, consisting of money ($\pi\lambda\eta\theta\omicron\varsigma\ \nu\omicron\mu\acute{\iota}\sigma\mu\alpha\tau\omicron\varsigma$ 1275^b 5-40), is unnatural as contrasted with the $\pi\lambda\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron\varsigma\ \delta\ \kappa\alpha\tau\grave{\alpha}\ \phi\acute{\upsilon}\sigma\iota\nu$ of the first kind (1257^b 19-20), and the commodities which form the wealth of the $\tau\rho\acute{\iota}\tau\omicron\nu\ \epsilon\acute{\iota}\delta\omicron\varsigma$ are clearly more like the unnatural wealth. To them also might be applied what is said of money in 1257^b 15 $\kappa\alpha\iota\tau\omicron\iota\ \dot{\alpha}\tau\omicron\pi\omicron\nu\ \tau\omicron\iota\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron\nu\ \dot{\epsilon}\iota\lambda\alpha\iota\ \pi\lambda\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron\nu\ \omicron\upsilon\ \epsilon\acute{\iota}\pi\omicron\rho\omega\nu\ \lambda\iota\mu\omega\ \dot{\alpha}\pi\omicron\lambda\epsilon\acute{\iota}\tau\alpha\iota$.

Further, the first kind of acquisition is more natural than the third in the sense in which the 'natural' is opposed to the 'artificial' rather than to the 'unnatural.'

This leads to the discussion of another passage which has caused difficulty and controversy. After describing various forms of livelihood corresponding to various forms of getting food, which therefore fall to the side of natural acquisition, Aristotle says (1256^a 40) $\omicron\iota\ \mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\ \omicron\upsilon\nu\ \beta\acute{\iota}\omicron\iota\ \tau\omicron\sigma\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron\iota\ \sigma\chi\epsilon\delta\acute{\omicron}\nu$

είσω, ὅσοι γε αὐτόφντον ἔχουσι τὴν ἐργασίαν, καὶ μὴ δὲ ἀλλαγῆς καὶ καπηλείας κομίζονται τὴν τροφήν, νομαδικὸς γεωργικὸς ληστρικὸς ἀλιευτικὸς θηρευτικὸς.

The expression αὐτόφντος ἐργασία is differently interpreted. Liddell and Scott make it the same as αὐτοργία. Another interpretation is "lives whose work is self-wrought" and not achieved with the help, or at the expense of others, like the life of ἀλλαγή καὶ καπηλεία. Bernays translates 'diejenigen welche auf Ausbeutung von Naturerzeugnissen beruhen.' Jowett—'whose labour is personal' or 'whose industry is employed immediately on the products of Nature.' Another renders 'a direct personal effort to obtain subsistence,' and says 'Aristotle is clearly thinking of direct action on nature but the stress of the argument would seem to be on the directness.' Another suggests 'who deal personally (i.e. at first hand) with nature in their work.'

It must be contended that none of these views are tenable, and that the explanation of the phrase is quite simple.

According to the analogy of compounds with αὐτο-, e.g. αὐτόματος, αὐτοδιδάκτος, the word αὐτόφντος cannot mean anything but 'grown up of itself,' very like αὐτοφνής: see the instances under the latter word in Liddell and Scott. The opposition is between that which 'springs up of itself,' naturally that is, and that which is the result of human design and choice (προαίρεσις), the natural as opposed to the artificial: an idea prominent in the first book of the *Politics*. Cf. 1252^b 28 καὶ τοῦτο οὐκ ἐκ προαιρέσεως... ἀλλὰ φύσικόν. αὐτόφντος is only a little more precise than φύσει.

Aristotle simply means that the industries (ἐργασίαι) which he has in view *spring up of themselves*, from our natural want of food, and from the means which nature¹ offers to supply it; and these are contrasted with industries founded rather upon our own thinking and contrivance, which are in this sense 'artificial.' And further on Aristotle puts this quite plainly, for, speaking of the same contrast between καπηλεία and the acquisition of natural products in the way of food, he says (1257^a 3) ἔστι δ' ἡ μὲν φύσει ἡ δ' οὐ φύσει αὐτῶν ἀλλὰ δὲ ἐμπειρίας τινὸς καὶ τέχνης γίνεται μᾶλλον, and so in the present context ἡ μὲν οὖν τοιαύτη κτήσις ὑπ'

¹ The βίος ληστρικὸς may seem an obvious exception, but yet Aristotle in a context where he is speaking expressly of this kind of life as well as of the others, says that in all of them the κτήσις, which is τροφή, is ὑπ' αὐτῆς τῆς φύσεως δεδομένη (already quoted).

αὐτῆς φαίνεται τῆς φύσεως δεδομένη πᾶσιν (1256^b 7).

From this point of view, then, the first kind of κτητική is natural and the second 'artificial'; and clearly the third kind as involving (in general) more art and contrivance than the first is so far like the second.

It remains to ask what place in the classification belongs to μεταβλητική, with which, or with a form of which, the τρίτον εἶδος has been erroneously identified by more than one writer. There are two kinds of μεταβλητική. The principal one, usually called by the generic name μεταβλητική without qualification, coincides with the second kind of κτητική. It is unnatural, as already explained, and ψεγομένη. It is sometimes called καπηλική and sometimes χρηματιστική in the narrow sense of the word as explained in 1256^b 40. It includes not only ἐμπορία, to which the term μεταβλητική seems the most appropriate, but also usury (τοκισμός) and μισθορνία, which again includes employment in the mechanical arts and bodily labour for hire.

The second kind of μεταβλητική is barter of natural products (edible, as will appear) for one another without the middleman's profits. Cf. 1257^b 25, αὐτὰ τὰ χρήσιμα πρὸς αὐτὰ καταλλάττονται. It is natural (1257^a 28, ἡ μὲν οὖν τοιαύτη μεταβλητική οὔτε παρὰ φύσιν κ.τ.λ.; cf. 1257^a 15, ἀρξαμένη τὸ μὲν πρῶτον ἐκ τοῦ κατὰ φύσιν) while the other is unnatural. It is necessary (cf. 1257^b 1, ἐκ τῆς ἀναγκαίας ἀλλαγῆς θάτερον εἶδος τῆς χρηματιστικῆς ἐγένετο), while the other is unnecessary (1258^a 15, τῆς μὴ ἀναγκαίας χρηματιστικῆς). Compare also 1257^a 18, ὅσον γὰρ ἱκανὸν αὐτοῖς ἀναγκαῖον ἦν ποιέσθαι τὴν ἀλλαγὴν (where one may suggest that the words ἱκανὸν and ἀναγκαῖον should be transposed) and 1257^a 23, ὣν κατὰ τὰς δεήσεις ἀναγκαῖον <ἦν> ποιέσθαι τὰς μεταδόσεις.²

Aristotle does not say in so many words to which of the three main classes the good μεταβλητική belongs: but it seems clearly to belong in conception to the first class,

Both are φύσει: cf. τὸ κατὰ φύσιν (1257^a 15) and οὐ παρὰ φύσιν (1257^a 28), said of the good μεταβλητική, with similar expressions for the first kind of χρηματιστική (οἰκονομική) in 1257^b 19, 1257^a 4, 1258^a 37. Both are ἀναγκαῖαι. Thus they are distinguished from the second main class (μεταβλητική = καπηλική) in the same manner. The statement that the good μεταβλητική is εἰς

² In 1257^a 17, τῆς ἀναγκαίας χρηματιστικῆς probably refers not only to the good μεταβλητική but to the whole of the first kind of χρηματιστική, as it certainly does in 1258^a 40.

ἀναπλήρωσιν τῆς κατὰ φύσιν αὐταρκείας (1257^a 30) is parallel to the description of the οἰκονομική κτητική as θησαυρισμὸς χρημάτων πρὸς ζωὴν ἀναγκαίων καὶ χρησίμων εἰς κοινωνίαν πόλεως ἢ οἰκίας.

Again the good μεταβλητική is said to be no kind of χρηματιστική at all—1257^a 28 ἢ μὲν οὖν τοιαύτη μεταβλητική οὔτε παρὰ φύσιν οὔτε χρηματιστικῆς ἐστὶν εἶδος οὐδέν. Here of course χρηματιστική is used in the narrow sense in which it is the second main class of acquisition = κατηλική. Thus the good μεταβλητική would fall to the first main class, for as yet Aristotle is keeping to a twofold division (διπλῆς οὐσῆς, 1258^a 39), the τρίτον εἶδος being an afterthought.

What are the commodities exchanged in the good μεταβλητική? In the passage which describes it, Aristotle is probably thinking of food-products only: (1) because the examples are of this sort (οἶνος, σίτος 1257^a 27), (2) because he implies that it is distinctive of what is opposed to the bad μεταβλητική to be περὶ τροφήν—1258^a 15 περὶ μὲν οὖν τῆς τε μὴ ἀναγκαίας χρηματιστικῆς...καὶ περὶ τῆς ἀναγκαίας, ὅτι ἑτέρα μὲν αὐτῆς οἰκονομική δὲ κατὰ φύσιν ἢ περὶ τροφήν κ.τ.λ.; and (3) because, as already said, he has not as yet thought of the inedible commodities with which the third class is concerned.

If it be asked how the simple barter of these latter for one another or for food would be classed, the answer seems to be that Aristotle has not considered the point; and this is not surprising, as the conception of the τρίτον εἶδος seems to have been developed after he had begun to write his theory down. According however to the principle of his threefold division, the μεταβλητική of these commodities would have the same kind of naturalness as the μεταβλητική of edibles, because the profit would not be ἀπ' ἀλλήλων: but possibly, if the question had occurred to him, Aristotle would have followed the analogy of his treatment of the direct acquisition of the inedible commodities, and considered the barter of them as not quite so natural as that of articles of food.

This unequal method of composition—development of the subject during the process of writing, not followed by adequate revision and adjustment—whatever may be the reason of it, is specially characteristic of

the *Politics*, though found in varying degrees in the other writings of Aristotle. It extends even to the structure of periods (cf. e.g. a good example in *Pol.* i. 1259^a 37–^b211) and may perhaps be the main reason for anomalies in the *Politics* which are often ascribed to the work of redactors.

A table of the classification of the Arts of Acquisition is added to illustrate the views put forward in this article.

J. COOK WILSON.

¹ It may be here noted that a lacuna has been erroneously assumed in the first part of the passage by Conring and others—

1259^a 37. ἐπεὶ δὲ τρία μέρη τῆς οἰκονομικῆς ἦν, ἐν μὲν δεσποτική, περὶ ἧς εἰρήται πρότερον, ἐν δὲ πατρική, τρίτον δὲ γαμική, —καὶ γὰρ γυναικὸς ἀρχεῖν καὶ τέκνων ὡς ἐλευθέρων μὲν ἀμφοῖν, οὐ τὸν αὐτὸν δὲ τρόπον τῆς ἀρχῆς, ἀλλὰ γυναικὸς μὲν πολιτικῶς τέκνων δὲ βασιλικῶς.

The lacuna is supposed to be after γαμική.

After writing or dictating the clause in which the three kinds of οἰκονομική are recapitulated, it seems to occur to Aristotle that, the rule in the first kind being of slaves, while the rule in both the second and third is over the free, the distinction between the two last kinds needs justification, i.e. it needs to be shown that there are really three kinds and not two, and so he adds what is in effect a parenthesis, καὶ γὰρ γυναικὸς, &c. The sense is 'Whereas there were, as we saw, three kinds of οἰκονομική, the first the management of slaves, the second that of children, the third that of a wife—[now there really are three] for, as we said, though the last two are alike in the fact that the rule in both is over the free, the nature of the rule is different in each case; in the one case it is a constitutional rule and the other monarchical.' The emphasis is thus upon the words οὐ τὸν αὐτὸν δὲ τρόπον τῆς ἀρχῆς. One of the commentators supposes so large a gap in the text before καὶ γὰρ that the English equivalent of what he thinks lost would occupy about twenty-four lines of a column of this *Journal*. Victorius says: 'statim autem causam affert, cur distinxerit copulam patris ac liberorum a copula viri et uxoris; docet enim illa imperia diversa esse,' and so doubtless took the passage as above suggested. Yet a commentator who quotes him does not seem to see that this was his meaning, and supposes that Aristotle's object in distinguishing the rule in πατρική from that in γαμική was to show 'that the two latter relations represent a higher kind of rule (πολιτική or βασιλική) than the former [i.e. δεσποτική], the result being that οἰκονομική is more concerned with πατρική and γαμική than with δεσποτική,' whereas Aristotle's object is simply to justify making three divisions of οἰκονομική instead of two.

κτητική = χρηματιστική (in wide sense of the term)

(i) ἐν εἶδος κτητικῆς κατὰ φύσιν μέρος τῆς οἰκονομικῆς 1256^b 27
τῆς χρηματιστικῆς διπλῆς οὐσίας 1258^a 38
γένος ἄλλο κτητικῆς ἦν μάλιστα καλοῦσι, καὶ δίκαιον αὐτὸ καλεῖν χρηματιστικὴν (in the narrow sense) 1256^b 40

θησαυρισμὸς χρημάτων πρὸς ζῶν ἀναγκαίων καὶ χρησίμων
εἰς κοινωνίαν πόλεως ἢ οἰκίας 1256^b 27

These χρήματα constitute ὁ ἀληθινὸς πλοῦτος 1256^b 30, = ὁ πλοῦτος ὁ κατὰ φύσιν 1257^b 19

Called οἰκονομική 1257^b 20, 1258^a 17, 39; μέρος τῆς οἰκονομίας 1258^a 28

κατὰ φύσιν ἐστὶν ἡ χρηματιστικὴ πᾶσιν ἀπὸ τῶν καρπῶν καὶ τῶν ζώων 1257^a 37
ἢ περὶ τροφῆν 1258^a 17

φύσει 1257^a 4; κατὰ φύσιν 1257^b 19
ἐπιστοιμμένη 1258^a 40
ἀναγκαία 1258^a 16, 40

= οἰκιστότητα χρηματιστικὴ 1258^b 20

* (1) 1258^b 12 seq.

(2) The good or natural kind of μεταβλητικὴ

(ἀπὸ ζώων) 1258^b 12 (ἀπὸ καρπῶν) γεωργία 1255^b 17
e.g. ἔσπων (ψιλλή τε καὶ πεφτυγμένη) αὐτὰ τὰ χρήσιμα πρὸς αὐτὰ καταλ-
λάττονται 1257^a 25

ἢ μὲν τοιαύτη μεταβλητικὴ οὐτε
παρὰ φύσιν οὐτε χρηματιστικῆς
ἐστὶν εἶδος οὐδὲν 1257^a 28
ἀναγκαία 1257^b 1

* The βίον named in 1256^b 1—μεταβίος, γεωργικός, λιπαστικός, ἀγροτικός—belong to this head, and are not strictly to the ἀγροτικός. This may seem not to apply strictly to the ἀγροτικός, though Aristotle himself describes it and the other lives all as modes of acquiring τροφή. However Aristotle has not got this classification of the βίον before him when making the classification in 1258^b 12.

(iii) (an afterthought) 1258^b 27

τρίτον δὲ εἶδος χρηματιστικῆς μεταξὺ τούτων (sc. τῆς δευτέρας) καὶ τῆς πρώτης . . .
ἔσται ἀπὸ γῆς (mining industries μεταλλευτικὴ) καὶ τῶν ἀπὸ γῆς γινόμενων ἀκάμπτων
μὲν χρησίμων δὲ (acquisition of inedible products of the soil—e.g. ἔλαιοσμα),

seq.

(1) ἐμπορία
(2) τοικισμός
(3) μεταβλητικὴ χρηματιστικὴ 1258^b 21 seq.

ναυκληρία, φορητήρια, παράστασις τῶν βασιλευσίων τεχνῶν τῶν ἀτέχνων
καὶ τῶν σά-
ματι, μόνον
χρησίμων

μὴ ἀναγκαία 1258^a 17

μεταβλητικὴ

-IS IN THE FUT. PERF. IND. AND PERF. SUBJ. IN LATIN.

THAT -is was the original quantity of the ending of the second person singular of the perf. subj. in Latin (originally an aorist optative), and -is that of the corresponding form of the fut. perf. ind. (originally an aorist subjunctive), is generally recognized. See Lindsay, *Latin Language*, pp. 500 and 510; Stolz, *Lat. Formenlehre*, in Müller's *Handbuch*, II.², pp. 374 and 377; Henry, *Précis*, 5th ed., pp. 157 and 326; Bennett, *Appendix*, pp. 149 and 150. It is evident also that the fut. perf. was influenced by the analogy of the perf. subj., for we find -is in the former as well in early Latin. See Neue, *Formenlehre*, II.², p. 510; Allen, *Remnants of Early Latin*, p. 11.

Regarding the quantity of these forms in the Classical Period there is not the same unanimity of opinion. Examples both of the fut. perf. ind. and of the perf. subj. in -is occur in the poets of the Augustan Age, and it is the treatment of these cases by recent editors which has suggested this brief note. A number of such instances are cited by Corssen, *Aussprache* II.², p. 497, and these are increased by Neue (*l. c.*). Corssen says that -is in both forms was *syllaba anceps* in the Augustan Age, but this view does not seem to be accepted by recent writers on the subject. That the short vowel ultimately prevailed is evidently the opinion of Stolz (*l. c.*, p. 377), although in the *Hist. Lat. Gr.*, p. 36, he does not, as Allen does, mention -is as a characteristic of archaic Latin, along with -at, -et, -it, etc.

Neue says: 'es scheint—dass ursprünglich in dem Perfectum Coniunct. i, im Fut. exact. i herrschend war, welcher Unterschied in der Aussprache jedoch bei der Ähnlichkeit der Bedeutung allmählig verwischt wurde. In dactylischen Versen hat die Rücksicht auf das dem Versmass angemessene unverkennbar auf die Quantität der Endung in den einzelnen Verba eingewirkt.' Lindsay, p. 500, citing Neue, says: 'In the Perfect Subjunctive endings i, not i, is correct; scansion with i are due to confusion with the Fut. Perf.'; and p. 510, 'scansions like *fecerimus* are due to the confusion of the Future-Perfect forms with Perfect Subjunctive forms.' Henry, p. 157, also citing Neue, arrives at quite a different conclusion; he says: 'Ces quantités sont archaïques; à l'époque classique on a *videris*, *viderimus* au pf. du subj. comme au fut. antér. Mais on lit encore, par exemple, *dederitis*, *Ov. Metam.* vi. 357.'

The treatment of these forms by makers of school grammars and by editors of the Augustan poets varies greatly, and in not a few cases it is uncertain whether the syllable is regarded as *anceps* or not. The recent editors of Horace apparently follow Corssen. At least, such an inference is justified by their treatment of the examples; for while they mention *-erunt*, *-it*, etc., in their lists of metrical peculiarities, and comment on them scrupulously in their notes, they pass over such cases as *dederis* (*Carm.* iv. 7, 20) and *occideris* (iv. 7, 21) without remark. So, for example, Kiessling and Smith, whose treatment of metrical matters is especially full. The earlier editors on the other hand (e.g. Duenzer) comment on -is as well. Greenough has a note on *fueris* (*Ep.* i. 6, 40, a perf. subj.), 'with long i, preserving the ancient quantity,' but none on *audieris* (*Sat.* ii. 5, 101, fut. perf. ind.), where the quantity seems more noteworthy, especially in view of the statement in his *Grammar*, which is quoted below.

Of the American school grammars, Gildersleeve-Lodge and Harkness write in their paradigms -is in both forms; while Allen and Greenough and Bennett give -is (i.e. -is). Under the head of Quantity Gildersleeve-Lodge has explicitly (p. 450): 'in the Second Person Sing. Fut. Pf. Indic. and Pf. Subjv. -is (*sic*) is common.' Allen and Greenough say (p. 397): 'final -is is long sometimes in the forms in -eris (perfect subjunctive), where it was originally long,' making no mention of the fut. perf. ind. Bennett does not mention either form as an exception to the general rule that final -is is short, which, considering the plan of his book as stated in his Preface, would seem to mean that he regards -is in both forms as short, and the cases of -is as metrical peculiarities.

A conclusion from the available material must be a matter of individual opinion, based on probability. I am inclined to regard the view of Henry as the correct one. It is at least certain that -is of the perf. subj. belongs to the same category as the other final syllables which were long in archaic Latin, but were afterwards shortened. It is also clear that the forms of the fut. perf. ind. were confused with those of the perf. subj., and that as a consequence we frequently find -is in the former and -is in the latter. There may well have been a

time when *-is* in both forms was *syllaba anceps*, and the point at issue is the date of that period. Considering the general shortening which took place in the final syllables of verb forms, and the fact that *-is* in both the perf. subj. and the fut. perf. ind. must frequently have been short at an early period, and perhaps taking into

account the analogy of *eris*, it seems highly probable that by the Augustan Age both forms regularly had *-is*, and that the use of *-is* by the poets of that period is in both cases a metrical license.

JOHN C. ROLFE.

University of Michigan.

PLATO AND ST. PAUL.

MANY years ago I compared the Pharisaic thanksgiving ascribed to Plato (or to Thales or Socrates) with the catholic breadth of St. Paul. I thought I had called Light-foot's attention to the evidence some thirty years ago, but as it is not noticed in the last editions of his commentaries, I must have mistaken the will for the deed. So far as I know, no one has anticipated me even yet. The texts speak for themselves.

Plutarch life of Marius 46 § 1: Πλάτων μὲν οὖν ἦδη πρὸς τῷ τελευτᾷ γεγόμενος ὕμνει τὸν αὐτοῦ δαίμονα καὶ τὴν τύχην, ὅτι πρῶτον μὲν ἀνθρώπος, εἰτα Ἕλληγ, οὐ βάρβαρος οὐδὲ ἄλογον τῇ φύσει θηρίον γένοιτο, πρὸς δὲ τούτοις ὅτι τοῖς Σωκράτους χρόνοις ἀπήντησεν ἡ γένεσις αὐτοῦ.

Lact. iii 19 § 17: non dissimile Platonis illud est, quod aiebat se gratias agere naturae: primum quod homo natus esset potius quam mutum animal, deinde quod mas potius quam femina, quod Graecus quam barbarus, postremo quod Atheniensis et quod temporibus Socratis.

Diogenes Laertius i § 33 (under Thales): Ερμύππος δ' ἐν τοῖς βίοις εἰς τούτον ἀναφέρει τὸ λεγόμενον ὑπὸ τινων περὶ Σωκράτους. ἔφασκε γάρ, φησί, τριῶν τούτων ἕνεκα χάριν ἔχειν τῇ τύχῃ· πρῶτον μὲν ὅτι ἀνθρώπος ἐγενόμην καὶ οὐ θηρίον· εἰτα ὅτι ἀνὴρ καὶ οὐ γυνή· τρίτον ὅτι Ἕλληγ καὶ οὐ βάρβαρος.

Ep. Gal. 3 28: οὐκ ἐνὶ Ἰουδαίῳ οὐδὲ Ἕλληγ· οὐκ ἐνὶ δοῦλῳ οὐδὲ ἐλεύθερῳ· οὐκ ἐν ἄρσεν καὶ θήλῃ· πάντες γὰρ ὑμεῖς εἰς ἓστε ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ.

Ep. Col. 3 11: ὅπου οὐκ ἐνὶ Ἕλληγ καὶ Ἰουδαίῳ, περιτομῇ καὶ ἀκροβυστία, βάρβαρος, Σκύθης, δοῦλος, ἐλεύθερος· ἀλλὰ τὰ πάντα καὶ ἐν πᾶσι Χριστός.

As the tradition was known to Plutarch, we may assume that it was not unknown in the lecture-rooms of Tarsus, and may have been in the mind of the apostle, when he proclaimed a fellowship which transcends all distinctions of sex, of race, of religious privilege, of intellectual culture.

I am aware that Jews to this day thank God in their prayers who has made them men, not women; Israelites, not Gentiles; but few would now follow the late Dr. Emanuel Deutsch (*Quarterly Review*, Oct. 1867, article on the Talmud) in assuming the immutability of Jewish oral tradition. Let those who are at home in Rabbinical lore tell us what is the earliest written authority for the modern prayer. It may be that it was suggested by the Gentile tradition. Of course if Gamaliel used the prayer, his pupil refers to it, not to the Platonic saying: but what right have we to make so bold an assumption?

JOHN E. B. MAYOR.

P.S. Dr. Gifford kindly refers me to the Talmud, *Berakhoth*, ch. ix, Schwab's translation, p. 156. 'R. Judah taught three things that a man should say every day: "Blessed be God; 1, for not creating me a pagan; 2, nor foolish; 3, nor a woman."'

THUCYDIDES VI. 21 FIN.

γνόντας ὅτι πολὺ τε ἀπὸ τῆς ἡμετέρας αὐτῶν μέλλομεν πλεῖν, καὶ οὐκ ἐν τῷ ὁμοίῳ στρατευσόμενοι καὶ ἐν τοῖς τῇδε ἐπηκόοις ἐξυμᾶχοι ἦλθετε ἐπὶ τινα, ὅθεν ῥᾶδιαι αἱ κομῆσαι ἐκ τῆς φιλίας ὧν προσέδει, ἀλλὰ ἐς ἀλλοτρίαν πᾶσαν ἀπαρτί

ιόντες, ἐξ ἧς μὲν οὐδὲ τεσσάρων τῶν χειμερινῶν ἀγγελῶν ῥᾶδιον ἐλθεῖν.

By thus reading ΑΠΑΡΤΙΗΟΝΤΕΣ in lieu of ΑΠΑΡΗΘΟΝΤΕΣ or ΑΠΑΡΤΙΟΝ-

TEC and the like, we get a perfect sense, 'but that we are on the contrary about to proceed to a country entirely occupied by others etc.' This use of ἀπαρτί may be said

hardly to have survived the generation to which Thucydides belonged, but its use in that generation is thoroughly established.

W. G. RUTHERFORD.

CICERO PRO MILONE c. 33 § 90.

AN ille praetor, ille uero consul, si modo haec templa atque ipsa moenia stare eo uiuo tam diu et consulatum eius expectare potuissent, ille denique uiuus mali nihil fecisset, qui mortuus, uno ex suis satellitibus [Sex. Clodio] duce, curiam incenderit?

This is now the vulgate, since Madvig in 1831 expelled the gloss *Sex. Clodio*. Mr A. C. Clark however proposes further to expel *duce* and then to write *cui mortuo unus* instead of *qui mortuus uno*: another editor adopts the proposal, and I see in the March number of this *Review*, p. 119, that Mr S. G. Owen approves it.

Between *qui mortuus uno* and *cui mortuo unus*, so far as authority goes, there is nothing to choose. The MSS split their votes: *qui mortuo unus* H, *cui mortuus uno* E, *cum mortuus uno* T. The exchange of *qui* and *cui* is quite common; quite common too is metathesis of inflexion, not only in this simple form, Stat. silu. iii 1 18 *angusto bis seni*, *angusti bis seno*, Aesch. supp. 373 ἀστροῖς . . . τῶνδε, ἀστροῦν . . . τοῖσδε, but also in stranger fashions, Ovid am. ii 5 27 *Phoebo . . . Dianam*, *Phoebum . . . Dianae*, Eur. Hipp. 331 αἰσχροῦν ἐσθλά, ἐσθλῶν αἰσchrά. The choice of reading therefore will depend on other considerations.

cui mortuo unus requires the expulsion of *duce*. Mr Clark says 'I conceive *Sex. Clodio duce* to have been a marginal note, founded upon Ascon. 34 *populus duce Sex. Clodio scriba corpus . . . intulit*, and ib. 55 *Sex. Clodius, quo auctore corpus . . . illatum fuit*.' There is nothing impossible about this; but the supposed adscript is at any rate of a much less common type than the gloss assumed by Madvig: here then the vulgate has the advantage.

But a much heavier objection to *cui mortuo unus . . . incenderit* is its rhetorical inferiority. If Cicero throws away his chance of this impressive figure, the dead man firing the senate-house, he is not the workman I take him for. Nay, for the sake of his argument, he cannot afford to throw it away; 'would Publius living have

done no evil when Publius dead burnt down the senate-house by the hand of Sextus?' has at least a superficial air of plausibility; but 'would Publius living have done no evil when Sextus burnt down the senate-house in honour of Publius dead?' gratuitously prompts the retort that you cannot fairly argue from what Sextus did to what Publius would have done.

But then on the other hand Mr Clark most justly impugns the sense of *uno ex suis satellitibus duce*: 'if we ask, whom the *satelles* led, the answer can only be, the ghost of Clodius.' When Publius fires the senate-house by the hand of Sextus, Sextus is not *dux*, he is *minister*; and *ministro* accordingly I suspect we should have found, had not the context suggested to Cicero a more vigorous and striking synonym: '*qui mortuus, uno ex suis satellitibus face, curiam incenderit*.' In Phil. ii 19 48 Antony's relation to this same P. Clodius is hit off by this same metaphor: Antony is '*eius omnium incendi-orum fax*,' the match with which he kindled all his conflagrations. The error in the MSS may have begun with the absorption of *f* in the preceding *s*: this often happens, and here in E and T the same cause has stolen away the *S* of *Sex* and left only *ex*.

Since I am writing about Cicero and quoting the second Philippic, I may as well assign to its author, the emendation, now thirty years old, of a ridiculous corruption still current in some texts of that speech. In 34 87 are these words: '*iam iam minime miror te otium perturbare; non modo urbem odisse sed etiam lucem; cum perditissimis latronibus non solum de die sed etiam in diem uiuere*': these are the dire effects of a guilty conscience. *in diem uiuere* is a well-known phrase and means 'to live for the day alone,' 'to take no thought for the morrow,' as the Gospel bids us; *de die uiuere* is not a well-known phrase but is supposed to mean 'to live on what the day brings in.' Antony therefore (so intolerable is his remorse for having offered the crown to Caesar) not only lives on what the day brings in, but even takes no thought for

the morrow, in the company of the most abandoned ruffians: the ruffians, I presume, assist him in these brutish excesses. This nonsense was emended, twenty years before C. F. W. Mueller or Hauschild, by Badham; but for fear the editors of Cicero should get wind of the emendation he stowed it away, where no one would think of looking for it, in the index to a recension of Plato's Euthydemus and Laches, and for further security muffled it up in a joke. On the

last page of the book, under the promising heading 'ὑγεινόν et εἰπεῖν οἶον confusa,' is this note:

'In Cic. Phil. ii 34 absurde legitur: *non solum de die, sed etiam in diem vivere*. Quam lectionem miror tamdiu τῶν κριτικῶν πονηρίῳ bixisse.'

That is to say, Cicero wrote '*non solum de die sed etiam in diem bibere*.'

A. E. HOUSMAN.

NOTE ON *REPUBLIC* 597 E.

MR. MAYOR'S interpretation of the words τρίτος τις ἀπὸ βασιλείως καὶ τῆς ἀληθείας πεφυκώς seems to me untenable. He takes the king to be the idea of the king as contrasted with the actual king and the stage king. But all through the context Plato exhausts the powers of language in distinguishing the real object, or 'idea,' from the other products which bear the same name. If no such distinction is here marked, the reasonable inference is that *this object*, unlike the 'bed,' carried its rank in itself. It is bad interpretation, I submit, to supply the essential point of a contrast, when it can easily be shown to be expressed. And the king, taken as the royal character, the type of truth and reality from whom all degrees of inferiority are measured (see 587 B-E), carries his rank, that of perfect ἀλήθεια, in himself. The absence of additional words indicating reality is thus natural. The conjunction of royalty and truth is so harped upon in the passage cited, and the process of counting removes from these attributes taken as practically the same, becomes in it so familiar, that in the total absence of other allusions to royalty, and of any slightest indication that the ideal king as opposed to the stage king is in question, I think the force of context alone compels us to suppose that the allusion is to the king as the true or real man. The whole scheme of books 8 and 9 is built upon this idea, and therefore there is nothing surprising in its cropping up even in an isolated expression early in book 10.

The dramatic poet, it should be remem-

bered, is accused in so many words, lower down, of setting up a bad government in the soul, just as when in a city the worthless obtain power and the decent people are ruined (605 B). This is the very process described in books 8 and 9; and the fact that it was in Plato's mind when he wrote book 10 removes the only difficulty attaching to the interpretation which I have suggested, viz. that in 587 the question is not of reality in general, but of reality of pleasures. Plato distinguishes but little between pleasures and desires, and in 597 E he is already connecting the tragic poet with the morbid appetites and emotions of which a little later he brands him as the instigator. I may add, though I do not insist very strongly upon it, that the sentence runs much better when a meaning is given to 'king,' by which πάντες οἱ ἄλλοι μιμηταί, and not only the tragic poet, may be estimated. All of them alike are 'third' or more from the royal character which is one with the standard of reality.

The view taken in Jowett and Campbell's commentary recognizes the reference to the language of book 9, but applies it in another way than that which I have suggested. I cannot see any reason for departing from the scheme which Plato so definitely indicates in 587 B-E compared with 445 D and the whole structure of books 8 and 9. The king is nowhere suggested to be God; he is the complete man, by whom all other men are measured in regard to their hold upon reality.

B. BOSANQUET.

VIRGIL, *ECL.* I. 68-70.

Ex umquam patrios longo post tempore finis
pauperis et tuguri congesto caespite culmen
post aliquot mea regna videns mirabor
aristas ?

Both the interpretations of v. 70 that have been offered are well objected to—without, however, the offer of anything better—in Conington's note *ad loc.* The traditional interpretation according to which *aristas* = *messes* = *aestates* = *annos*, would have everything in its favour, but for the feeble *aliquot*. But it seems not to have occurred to any one to correct this word. I have long thought, and still think, that the passage is to

be righted by a change—palaeographically scarcely a change—in *aliquot*. I would write and point the passage thus :

en umquam patrios longo post tempore finis
pauperis et tuguri congesto caespite culmen—
post, ah, quot mea regna videns mirabor
aristas ?

It may be added that *ah* occurs in the *Eclogues* as follows : 1, 15 ; 2, 60 ; 6, 47, 52, 77 ; 10, 47, 48, 49.

MORTIMER LAMSON EARLE.

Bryn Mawr College, Pennsylvania.

OSCAN PRUFFED AGAIN.

PROFESSOR ALLEN's interpretation of Oscan *pruffed* in the February number of the *Classical Review* is likely to meet with general approval. It is clear enough from the inscription Zvet. *Inscr. Ital. Infer.* no. 140 that the current translation '*probavit*' is unsuitable, and there seems to be no formal difficulty in his derivation of the form from **profefed* = *prodidit* in the sense of '*posuit*.'

In separating *pruffed* from **prufaum* (*priffatted*) Prof. Allen may be said to have rid us of a public nuisance. For this form has been a stumbling-block in the way of recognizing clearly what the mass of evidence points to, namely that the representation of original labial + *u* as a simple labial is not merely Latin (*probus*, *legēbant*, etc.), but also Oscan-Umbrian and so probably Italic. Cf. v. Planta, *Gram. d. osk-umbr. Dialekte*, p. 191 and my '*Osc. Umbr. Verb-System*,' *Studies in Classical Philology of the University of Chicago*, vol. i. p. 172. And the only possible support for the view which attributes the double *f* of certain preterit forms to the *u* of the original *fu* is thus removed. Moreover the actual existence of an *ff*-preterit becomes doubtful. I have recently (*l.c.* p. 171) emphasized the fact that the normal orthography of the *t*- and *f*-

preterits is *tt*, but *f* not *ff*, the latter being found only in *aamanaffed* '*mandavit*' and the difficult *staieffuf*. But if once we admit an Oscan *-ffed* = **fefed* we may assume the same in *aamanaffed*, thus returning in part to the view of Bugge, *Altitt. Stud.* p. 17. The anaptyctic vowel (*manaffed* for *manffed*) makes no difficulty in view of *Anafriss*, nor is there any good reason why we should not group Lat. *mandō* with *condō* etc., assuming a transfer to the first conjugation. The only remaining example of an *ff*-preterit would then be *staieffuf*, which Bücheler has taken as a perfect active participle and which I have attempted to elucidate further as such, *l.c.* p. 185. Any one who will furnish a perfectly convincing explanation of this form (or forms, as the case may be) will be entitled to an unusual degree of gratitude.

I may take this opportunity of correcting an unfortunate misprint in the February number of the *Classical Review* which made a sentence of mine quite unintelligible. On p. 61, 1st column, 2nd paragraph, 7th line, for *Latin*, *v* is a *spirant*, read *Latin* *u* as a *spirant*. In 2nd column of same page near end, for *e* : *y*, *o* : *w*, read *ε* : *η*, *o* : *ω*.

CARL D. BUCK.

THE ITALIC VERB *EEHIIA- EHIA-*.

INASMUCH as students of the Italic dialects are at variance as to the correct explanation of the Italic verb-forms *ehiato* (Umbr.) and *eehiianasúm* (Osc.), I may be pardoned for venturing to add the following contribution to the discussion of the subject, in the hope that the explanation offered may possibly prove acceptable.

The single passage in which Umbr. *ehiato* occurs (*Tab. Ig. vii. B.*) runs thus: ¹ *Pisi panupei fratres fratrus Atiersir fust, erec sveso fratrecate portata sevace fratrom |* ² *Atiersio descenduf, pifi reper fratrecate parsetst erom ehiao, ponne ivengar tursiandu herlei,* ³ *appei arfertur Atiersir poplom andersufust;* which, being interpreted according to Bücheler, *Umbrica*, 1883, pp. 117-119, means 'Quisquis quandoque magister fratribus Atiediis erit, is suo magisterio portet hostias fratrum | Atiedium duodecim, quas pro re conlegii par erit esse emissas, cum iuvencae fugentur oportet, | ubi flamen Atiedius populum lustraverit.'

Bücheler, *op. cit.* pp. 118 sq., explains the meaning of the word *ehiao* in this passage as follows: 'Quia tenaciter arteque *ehiom* convictum est cum boum persecutione, hanc ipsam quod praemunivit et antecessit id sic dictum arbitror. Exacta autem et exempta vinculis et emissa oportuit quae super forum fugarentur animalia, eaque plura ibi quam tria adfuisse cum *peracrio* genetivus A 51¹ affert suspicionem tum lueulentur illud *quas tres primum ceperint*² confirmat.'

Some time after the publication of Bücheler's *Umbrica*, a cippus of tufa was discovered at Capua, bearing Oscan inscriptions on both sides, which, so far as the words can with certainty be deciphered, run thus:—

I. ... | ... | . pas fi[i.]et | pústrei.
iúklei | eehiianasúm | aet.
sakrim | fakiiad kasit |
medikk. túvtik | Kapv.
adpod | fiiet.

¹ For the sake of greater clearness, the passage (*Tab. Ig. A. 51-53*) may be quoted in full. According to Bücheler's translation (*Umbrica*, pp. 114-116) it runs thus: 'Tum iuvencae ex opimis' (Umbr. *ivenga peracrio*) 'fuganto, qui virgam imperatoriam habebit et prinovati' (praenovati). 'Infra forum decurionale capiunto civitatis quisquis volet. Quas tris primum ceperint, eas in Aquilonia facito Tursae Iovinae pro populo civitatis Iguvinae, pro civitate Iguvina.'

² See above, note 1.

II. ... | ... | ... | ... | damsennias
| pas fiiet pústr | iúklei
[e]ehiian | medik. minive
| kersnai[i]as.

These two inscriptions have been ably discussed by Bücheler in the *Rheinisches Museum*, vol. xliii, 1888, pp. 557-563, from which the translation of I. would appear to be: '(At the flesh distributions) which take place at the next following dedication *emittendarum* (sc. *hostiarum* or *iuvenearum*; cf. the Umbrian passage quoted above) let some one place a sacrificial portion for the purposes of the Capuan meddix tuticus, in so far as and so long as such distributions take place.'

The form [e]ehiian, occurring in II., is presumably an abbreviation of the longer form *eehiianasúm* (occurring in I.), which is obviously gen. fem. plur. of the gerundive (cf. Bücheler, *Rh. M.*, *ib.*, p. 560).

For the explanation of the meaning of this latter word Bücheler, *Rh. M.*, *l.c.*, refers us back to his explanation of Umbr. *ehiao*, quoted above from *Umbrica*, p. 118; his whole note, however, is eminently worth quoting: 'Das Sühnefest der iguvinischen Gemeinde schliesst damit, dass Sündenböcke, vielmehr *iuvencae* über den Gemeindeplatz gejagt, dann unter Theilnahme der ganzen Gemeinde eingefangen und die drei erst-gefangenen geopfert werden; der atiedische Brudermeister hat dafür 12 Opferthiere zu stellen, welche im Interesse der Bruderschaft sollen werden *ehiao*, wenn die Rinder gejagt werden müssen zum Schluss des Gemeindefests, *Ig. vii. B. 2*, wie ich *Umbr. p. 118* das Wort zu deuten versucht habe, *exacta et exempta vinculis et emissa, ἐξέμνα*. Die Verwendung zum allgemeinen Besten macht die Emission thatsächlich zur Largition; spross nicht aus solchem Brauch die Redeweise *edere munus*!'

The translation of Umbr. *ehiao* and Osc. *eehiianasúm* by 'emissos, emittendarum,' seems, despite the objection raised by C. D. Buck, *Der Voc. der Osk. Spr.*, 1892, p. 47, highly probable and satisfactory. Such a meaning appears to suit the context in all three passages where the word occurs.

Not so satisfactory, however, is Bücheler's explanation of the form of the verb in question. In *Umbrica*, p. 119, he endeavours to explain the Umbrian form by the suggestion that '*eh-iatu* fortasse sic est ad

etu (ito) ut *fugato* ad *fugito* aut ut *ierō* ad *īro*,¹ and in *Rh. M.*, *ib.*, p. 560, he refers to this explanation of the Umbrian form, in explanation also of the Oscan form. This seems a most unlikely suggestion, and it is hardly surprising to find that scholars have sought some other explanation of the forms.

I venture to think that G. Bronisch, *Die Osk. i- und e- Vocale*, 1892, p. 118, and Buck, *op. cit.*, p. 47, have hit upon the true solution, by connecting the forms under discussion with the Latin verb *hiō hiare*; an explanation which had also occurred to me quite independently.

Inasmuch, however, as Bronisch and Buck have failed to extract any meaning from the forms, as thus connected, the object of the present paper is: 'to show that Umbr. *ehiato* Osc. *eehiianasūm*, as thus connected with Lat. *hiō hiare*, admit of a perfectly intelligible meaning, almost identical with that given by Bücheler (*vid. supra*), and suitable to the context in each of the three passages where the verb occurs.'

Umbr. *ehiato* Osc. *eehiianasūm*, so far as the forms are concerned, correspond to Lat. **ē-(or ex-)hiātos* **ē-(or ex-)hiandarum*.¹

The meaning of the forms, thus explained, is not attempted at all by Bronisch. And Buck, in his discussion of the forms, *op. cit.*, p. 47, fails to come to any conclusion. He fails because he appears to think that the meaning of the verb in question, the original form of which he gives as **ē-hiā-om*, should (in order to suit the context) be 'to kill.' With his remark, made on this assumption, one cannot but agree: 'selbst wenn man eine causativische Bedeutung fürs umbr. und fürs osk. annehmen wollte, so gehört doch wohl etwas Phantasie dazu, ein "ausgähnen lassen" zu der Bedeutung von "ausatmen lassen, töten," das recht gut passen würde, zu bringen.'²

But is it not possible to extract another meaning (one similar to that given by Bücheler, *v. supra*) from the forms as now derived? Uses of the cognate words in Latin, Greek, and English, seem to point to a possible explanation.

For instances of Lat. *hiō* used transitively we may cite Val. Fl. 6, 706, *Subitos ex ore cruores | saucia tigris hiat* ('emits'). With the meaning 'emit (sound),' the verb occurs in Prop. 2, 31 (= 3, 29), 6 and Persius 5, 3.

¹ For the explanation of the *ee* in the Oscan form see Bronisch, *op. cit.*, p. 161, Buck, *op. cit.*, p. 175.

² Elsewhere in his book, pp. 32, 36, 126, Buck says of Osc. *eehiianasūm* 'Bedeutung nicht sicher' or 'unsicher.'

With *hiō* in the latter meaning we may compare the similar use of the cognate Lat. *hi-sco* in Att. *ap. Non.* 120, 30; Prop. 3, 3 (= 4, 2), 4; Ovid, *Met.* 13, 231. Similarly also the use of the cognate Gk. *χαίρω* in Soph. *Aj.* 1227, Aristoph. *Vesp.* 342, Callim. *Ap.* 24.

In English we find the cognate *yawn* used of opening in order to emit (as well as of opening in order to swallow); cf. e.g. Shakspeare, *Much Ado*, V. iii. 19, *Julius Caesar*, II. ii. 18, *Hamlet* III. ii. 407. Compare also the lines of another old dramatist, John Marston, *Antonio and Mellida*, The Second Part, III. i. 188 sq. :—

'Now gapes the graves, and through their yawns let loose
Imprison'd spirits to revisit earth.'

Thus then the Italic verb **ē-hiā-om*, corresponding to the Lat. **ē-(or ex-)hiā-re*, will have literally meant 'to yawn—forth,' and, when applied in the Passive to the sacrificial victims, which were to be driven forth from their enclosure, den, or cage, and pursued across the forum by the community, will have meant literally 'yawned—forth,' that is (if we may venture to paraphrase Marston's words), 'let loose through their prison's yawns.'

In this connexion reference may be made to the phraseology employed in many passages by Latin authors concerning the horses and chariots in the races; cf. e.g. Enn. *ap. Cic. De Divin.* 1, 48, § 107 :—

'Expectant, veluti, consul cum mittere signum
Volt, omnes avidi spectant ad carceris oras,
Quam mox emittat pictis ex faucibus currus.'

Compare also Lucret. 2, 263 sqq.; Verg. *Georg.* 1, 512; 3, 104; *Aen.* 5, 145; Hor. *Sat.* 1, 1, 114; Tibull. 1. 4, 32; Auctor *Incert. Ad C. Herennium* 4, 3, § 4; Ovid *Heroid.* 18, 166, *Met.* 10, 652 sq., *Trist.* 5, 9, 29 sq. and 12, 26; Stat. *Theb.* 6, 522, etc.

Lat. *hiō*, it is true, is more frequently intransitive than transitive; but no objection can be raised on this ground against the above-suggested explanation of the forms in question, for a close parallel to Lat. **ē-hiare* 'to yawn—forth' is afforded by Lat. *ex-cantare* 'to sing—forth, to charm—forth,' for which see, e.g. Tab. xii. *ap. Plin.* 28, 2, 4 § 17, Hor. *Epod.* 5, 45, Prop. 3, 3 (= 4, 2), 49, Luc. 6, 686, and 9, 931.

L. HORTON-SMITH.

GILBERT'S GREEK CONSTITUTIONAL ANTIQUITIES.

The Constitutional Antiquities of Sparta and Athens, by Dr. GUSTAV GILBERT, translated by E. J. BROOKS, M.A. and T. NICKLIN, M.A., with an introductory note by J. E. SANDYS, Litt.D. Swan Sonnenschein & Co. 1895. 10s. 6d.

THE merits of Dr. Gustav Gilbert's 'Manual of Greek Constitutional Antiquities' (*Handbuch der griechischen Staatsalterthümer*) have long been known to scholars. The first instalment of the work, originally published in 1881, at once took rank as a masterpiece of its kind. Admirable in method, fully competent in knowledge, and by no means devoid of original suggestions, the book quickly proved to be of high service to Hellenists, *inter alia* as a canon for the purpose of regulating and directing their studies in the political antiquities of Greece. The complete work comprises two volumes, the first dealing with the institutions of Sparta and Athens; the second (published in 1885) containing an inventory of knowledge for the other all too numerous and lesser known city-states of Hellas. From the nature of the case and from the condition of the evidences the second volume was inevitably destined to a less complete success than its precursor. In dealing with Greek states other than Sparta and Athens the scant and fragmentary evidences do not afford materials for an adequate characteristic or history, even in such notable instances as Thebes and Corinth, Elis and Corcyra, to say nothing of the infinity of Greek constitutions throughout the *diaspora*, from Mas-salia to Poseideion, from Olbia to Cyrene. In all that region we are constantly baffled by the failure of evidence, while the generalized history and system of the Greek City State, which take the place of fuller and more exact knowledge of particular city-states, are but a poor consolation to the historian a-hungering for realities. Even in regard to Sparta how much is left to be desired! Thucydides could believe that for upwards of four centuries there had been no constitutional movement or history in Sparta. Laconian secretiveness had dried up the inner sources of Laconian fame, even for the predecessors of Aristotle. Police regulations and other reserves seem to have made the description of contemporary institutions in Sparta a difficult and inconclusive task. The happier fortune, the more gener-

ous self-advertisement of Athens have enriched posterity with more copious vision and rewarded Athens with an imperishable crown. Even in the first edition of Gilbert's first volume three-quarters of the whole was devoted to Athens. Since then the constantly growing wealth of epigraphic material, and the epoch-making discovery of the lost Aristotelian tract on the *Athenian Polity*, have further aggrandized Athens, as by a new transfer to her of the common fund. Athens is become for the time more than ever the centre of Hellenic interests. In the second edition of Gilbert's first volume (1893) Athens absorbs four-fifths of the text, without reckoning the *Introduction* on 'Aristotle's *Ἀθηναίων πολιτεία*.' It is from this second edition that the translation now under review has been made. The translation was a work well worth doing, and it has been, upon the whole, well done. Barring an unfortunate negative in the third line of the Author's Preface I have observed nothing much to mislead and very little to displease a scholarly reader. The translation is indeed a good illustration of the advantage of work done by properly trained hands. The translators obviously not merely possess a good knowledge of German, but have brought all the advantages of a classical training to bear upon their work. As a result the *Handbook* is readable in its English form. The extremely business-like character of the original dispenses, indeed, with ornament, and in this respect the English version very properly follows suit: but it has the great merit of rendering the German as a rule into the English idiom. The scholarly character of the work is further guaranteed by the scrupulous fidelity with which Gilbert's notes, including all quotations and references, have been reproduced. One could have desired that the translators had adhered to the stricter purism of the German original in the transliteration of Greek words and names. A work of this kind offered a good opportunity for striking a blow against the desperate anarchy of our English practices in this particular. A correctness which was acceptable to Robert Browning in his poetic workshop should not be too pedantic for the Cambridge Senate House, or for the Oxford Schools. I venture to repeat a protest against the version of *κληροῦν* *et cog.* by 'to choose by lot.' The

words 'choice' 'choose,' were better reserved for αἵρεσις, αἰρεῖσθαι *et cog.*, and this protest applies to rendering Gilbert's word *erloost* into 'chosen by lot' (e.g. *E.T.* p. 139), much more, into 'chosen' *simpliciter* (*ib.* p. 391). The use of these technical terms is extremely precise in the Greek and is observed by Gilbert in his German; nothing is gained for accurate knowledge by substituting in English phrases which only avoid inconsequence by being deprived of concrete significance. I had noted two or three expressions which the translators might perhaps better from the point of view of our idiom: 'military artists' may carry a false suggestion to this or that English reader, nor is it quite equivalent to the German *Kriegskünstler* [or to the Greek τεχνίται τῶν πολεμικῶν]. The description of Solon starting on his travels 'in perfect self-denial' (p. 141) has a slightly droll solemnity about it, which is not justified by the German *unternahm voller Selbstverleugnung eine laengere Reise*. A few such objections in so large a labour but accentuate our commendation. The chief secret of the translators' success is doubtless that they have been genuinely interested in the subject of the work, and the Public Orator in the University of Cambridge, who has written the *Introductory Note*, is to be congratulated, if he can count among his pupils any large number of scholars competent to undertake and perform so well such services to the cause of Hellenic studies under his inspiration.

This paper has been somewhat retarded by circumstances, and I have thought to make some amends to the distinguished author, and his English editors, by subjoining two or three notes on particular points, where the views maintained in the *Handbook* may be open to question, or revision. This course may also commend itself to readers of the *Classical Review*, few, if any, of whom can require to be told at any length that Gilbert's book, in the original or in this serviceable translation, is indispensable now to every scholar's library. I take three corn-stalks out of my sheaf, on which to practise a critical experiment: (1) Gilbert's general estimate of the Ἀθηναίων πολιτεία: (2) Gilbert's theory concerning the age for the enrolment of the Athenian citizen: (3) A point in regard to the constitution of the Athenian *dikasteria*, in which Gilbert argues against a result which was established by Fraenkel in 1877 to the general satisfaction of those qualified to judge. The following remarks are not to

be regarded as conveying any general censure upon Gilbert's work. I can conceive no better way of paying homage to the labours of a scholar, than by taking the trouble to discuss relatively small points in a whole, for which one has nothing but commendation and gratitude to express.

(1) *Gilbert's estimate of the Ἀθηναίων πολιτεία.*

It was natural enough for the author, in view of the publication of the Ἀθηναίων πολιτεία in 1891, to explain, as he has done in the *Introduction* to the new edition of his work, his own exact relation to the recovered authority. It must, however, be observed that, valuable as the *Introduction* may in itself be, it has a disturbing effect upon the economy of the *Handbook* as a whole. A somewhat exaggerated value has, perhaps, temporarily accrued to the text of the Ἀθηναίων πολιτεία owing to the circumstances of its long eclipse and late recovery. When the critique of the new authority shall have been more nearly than at present accomplished, it will not be necessary for a writer upon the Institutions of Athens to select this one source for special discussion to the exclusion of the rest. In the next edition of his *Handbook* Dr. Gilbert will, perhaps, convert the *Introduction* into a more general and critical survey of the sources at large, or else relegate the expression of his personal views upon the Ἀθηναίων πολιτεία to the *Preface*, or to a foot-note. In regard to the authority of the new text Dr. Gilbert appears to me to have surrendered too easily. For all he says, the newly discovered text might be not merely a fragmentary and inaccurate transcript by various hands of a copy of a treatise ascribed, more or less uncritically, to Aristotle, but a veritable autograph from the pen of that philosopher himself! Naturally Dr. Gilbert feels inclined to bow down before such an authority, and seriously defends the more transparently rationalistic passages of domestic history, such as the accounts of Themistokles and Aristides, the seventeen years of Areiopagite regimen after the Persian wars, the curious remark on the incompetence of the Strategoi in the days before the introduction of mercenary soldiers, and so on. Dr. Gilbert regards even the account of the Drakonian constitution as 'valuable information founded on documentary evidence which we are not justified in rejecting in favour of conjectures of our own,' (p. xxxix.). It would take too long here to apologize for 'conjectures of our own,' nor are we always bound to substitute a modern for an ancient

hypothesis on rejecting the latter: but how a critical historian can treat the passages on Drakon as genuine history, or tradition, remains to me somewhat of a mystery. It may be observed, in addition, that Dr. Gilbert's *obiter dicta* on Herodotus and Thucydides in their relation to the Ἀθηναίων πολιτεία are not always quite convincing. His remark (*Introduction* p. xxvii.) that 'in Herodotus' day the prevalent opinion at Athens was that the Alcmeonidai established themselves at Delphi, won over the Pythia by bribery,' etc. etc., is based on Hdt. 5, 62, 63. But, even if we ignore Schweighaeuser's plausible conjecture of Λακεδαιμόνιοι for Ἀθηναῖοι in c. 63, it does not follow that the prevalent opinion in Athens at any time was what is there recorded. Again, is it not a little rash to describe the *πρωτάνεις τῶν ναυκράων* in Hdt. 5, 71 as 'an invention of Herodotus' (*E.T.* p. 122 n. *eine Erfindung Herodots* in the original)? And does not the remark, that the temple-building at Delphi mentioned in Hdt. 5, 62 cannot be the same as that mentioned in Hdt. 2, 180 (*E.T.* p. 145 n.), seem to miss the point of the preposition in ἐξοικοδομῆσαι? The rebuilding might have been begun in the reign of Amasis even if it was not completed until the time of Kleisthenes. It is, perhaps, paying Thucydides' account of the family relations of the Peisistratidai too high a compliment to describe it as 'resting on the evidence of inscriptions' (*Introduction* p. xxxviii.), even though Thucydides quotes two inscriptions to the point and might doubtless have quoted others; and in this connexion one misses in the *Introduction* a reference to Beloch's theory that the two exiles of Peisistratos are a product of false inference and combination, the earliest effects of which appear in Herodotus—an ingenious theory which, if accepted, will furnish a good example of the substitution of 'a conjecture of our own' for 'a conclusion of Aristotle's' (cp. p. xxxviii.)—not unattended with advantage.

(2) *Gilbert's theory on the age of enrolment* (ἢ τῶν πολιτῶν ἐγγραφῇ), or of legal majority at Athens.

This case is especially interesting for the present purpose because here, for once, Dr. Gilbert undertakes to correct an explicit statement in the Ἀθηναίων πολιτεία, and in the stronger part of it, to wit, the second part, which deals with Athenian institutions as they were in the writer's own day. It should be a very convincing argument to lead us in such a case to substitute 'a conjecture of our own' for 'a conclusion of

Aristotle's.' Now, what is the state of this case?

The text in question runs: ἐγγράφονται δ' ἐς τοὺς δημότας ὀκτωκαίδεκα ἔτη γεγονότες c. 42.

These words can only mean: 'citizens are inscribed on the demotic lists when they are eighteen years of age.' The context shows that great pains were taken to prevent premature enrolment.

Yet Gilbert maintains (*E.T.* p. 197) that the words mean, not when they are 18 (*i.e.* in the 19th year of age), but 'upon the completion of the 17th year,' *i.e.* in the course of their 18th year, or in other words, before they are fully 18 years of age.

He bases this interpretation upon the case of the orator Demosthenes, in regard to whose majority we have some apparently precise information.

As, however, the Greek text quoted can only bear one clear meaning, if the case of Demosthenes proves that the orator attained his majority before he was 18 years of age, the following dilemma will arise: either the Ἀθηναίων πολιτεία is in error, or the enrolment of Demosthenes was premature and illegal. Both alternatives are equally improbable. I hope to show that the case of Demosthenes is not adverse to the statement in the Ἀθηναίων πολιτεία, and that other evidence goes to support that statement.

The case of Demosthenes may be exhibited as follows after Gilbert (*E.T.* p. 197):—

(i.) Demosthenes was seven years old when his father died. Dem. 27, 4.

(ii.) Demosthenes was ten years and a few days under guardianship. *Ib.* 6.

(iii.) Demosthenes then came of age, *i.e.* was enrolled on the ληξιαρχικὸν γραμματεῖον.

In regard to (i.), the words in point are: οἶμός πατὴρ... κατέλειπεν... ἐμὲ... ἐπὶ ἑπτὰ... Are these words to be taken as meaning *exactly seven years to a day*? That is not very likely. The words may well mean: *not yet eight years of age*. (On the analogy of Gilbert's rendering of ὀκτωκαίδεκα ἔτη γεγονώς the words here in question should mean *not yet seven full years old*: which would prove too much for his argument!)

In regard to (ii.), the words are: δέκα ἔτη ἡμᾶς ἐπιτροπεύσαντες. There is nothing in the text about 'a few days' extra. These 'few days' are apparently due to an inference, in itself plausible enough. But if 'a few days' may be added to the ten years here, why not to the seven years above?

There are frequent references to the δέκα ἔτη throughout the speech, and oddly enough § 69 concludes, Ἀφοβὸν δὲ μὴδ' ἦν ἔλαβε προῖκ' ἐθέλοντα ἀποδοῦναι καὶ ταῦτ' ἔτεϊ δέκα ἔτη, which strictly interpreted should mean only 'after nine years.'

In regard to (iii.), it must be observed that there is nothing in the speech, exact or definite, about the date of the orator's enrolment, or coming of age. The words in § 5, τοσοῦτον χρόνον ἔως ἐγὼ ἀνὴρ εἶναι δοκιμασθῆναι, leave the period an open question, even if they are to be interpreted as referring to the ἐγγραφὴ εἰς τοὺς δημότας. But, even if the examination (δοκιμασία) is here practically identical with the registration (ἐγγραφή), the question of the exact age of Demosthenes at the time is still left open.

Another passage, however, throws light on the point. In 30, 15 Demosthenes states that he brought the action against his guardian in the Archonship of Polyzelos, in the month Skirophorion, in which month also his δοκιμασία had taken place.

In the same passage he reckons a period of 'two years' between the Skirophorion of Polyzelos and the Poseideon of Timokrates.

The list of Archons is as follows:—

Polyzelos,	Ol. 103.2 = 367-6 B.C.
Kephisodoros,	Ol. 103.3 = 366-5 B.C.
Chion,	Ol. 103.4 = 365-4 B.C.
Timokrates,	Ol. 104.1 = 364-3 B.C.

The Skirophorion of Polyzelos coincides, roughly speaking, with June 366 B.C. The Poseideon of Timokrates coincides similarly with December 364 B.C., and the 'two years' equals therefore two years and six months. On this analogy, 'ten years' might stand for ten years and six months, and 'seven years' might stand for seven years and six months, more or less: and in any case it is obvious that an exact argument for the interpretation, or refutation, of the text in the Ἀθηναίων πολιτεία cannot be based on the data in Demosthenes, and that, to all appearance, Demosthenes may have been fully eighteen years of age before he brought his action, or was inscribed on the roll of his Deme, and presumably was so old.

But that is not all. Gilbert appears to have overlooked in this connexion the bearing of the list of *Eponymoi* upon the problem of the ephebic majority.

It is, by the way, a curious fact that Gilbert still thinks the 42 *Eponymoi* of the *Hoplites* (ἐπώνυμοι τῶν ἡλικίων) identical with the Archons of a man's years of service

(*E.T.* p. 315). The true interpretation of Ἀθην. πολ. 53, 4 we owe to Mr. Kenyon, and it appeared already in his *editio princeps* of 1891. But whether the 42 *Eponymoi* were Archons, as Gilbert still thinks, or Heroes, as Kenyon then showed, the facts remain that the 42 names marked 42 years of service, and that the last year of service was the 60th year of a man's age, during which he served as a *Diaitetes*. But, if the 42nd *Eponymos* corresponds to the 60th year of a man's age, the first *Eponymos* must correspond to the 19th year of a man's age: Q. E. D.

It is, therefore, obvious now that Gilbert's interpretation of Ἀθην. πολ. 42, 1 is unacceptable; that the case of Demosthenes is not an instance against the correct interpretation; and that the correct interpretation is completely borne out by the use of the 42 *Eponymoi*. The legal age for the enrolment or registration (ἐγγραφή) was on the completion of the 18th year, i.e. in the course of the 19th year, precisely as stated in the passage in question.

The Ephebic training lasted two years: a citizen would not join the mass, 'be with the rest' (μετὰ τῶν ἄλλων), until he had completed his 20th year. As everybody in Athens born in one year was not born on the same day of the year, the legal regulations did not work out with precisely the same coincidence in all cases, but this point needs not to be pursued further at present. It will here suffice to have vindicated the true interpretation of the passage in question from the gloss which Gilbert has put upon it.

(3) *Gilbert's view of the composition of the grand Jury (album iudicum)*: Were there ever 6,000 *dikasts* in Athens?

On this point there is more room for dispute, and I cannot expect to carry all suffrages in favour of the view to be here propounded. The case presents a test for the critique of the Ἀθηναίων πολιτεία, as well as an important problem in the constitutional history of Athens. If Dr. Gilbert is right, the Ἀθηναίων πολιτεία has determined a controversy concerning the number and composition of what we may, perhaps, call the great, or grand, Jury at Athens, and has demonstrated a remarkable change or reform in this matter, affording a fresh contrast between the conditions of the fifth and of the fourth centuries B.C. I hope now to show good reason for disqualifying the authority of the Ἀθηναίων πολιτεία in this regard, and for denying the supposed contrast in this particular.

It was a received opinion twenty years ago that year by year in old Athens a great jury of 6,000 dikasts used to be impanelled by lot, out of which great panel particular juries were constituted by a further sortition as occasion demanded. This theory, however, was not two centuries old. It was devised by Valesius (Henri de Valois), and developed by Matthiae and Schoemann. It was the result of ingenious inference and combination, starting from the lines in Aristophanes, *Wasps*, 661, 2:—

ἀπὸ τούτων νῦν κατὰθες μισθὸν τοῖσι δικασταῖς
ἐναντοῦ,
ἐξ ἑξακισχίλιων, κοῦπω πλείους ἐν τῇ χώρᾳ
κατένασθεν...

and the complete confutation of this modern theory was among the most certain results of Max Fraenkel's brilliant monograph, *Die attischen Geschworenengerichte*, Berlin, 1877. But lo! here comes the 'Ἀθηναίων πολιτεία' back from the dead, bringing the 6,000 dikasts with it! There they are, as large as life, in chapter 24, among the 'twenty thousand men and more,' supported and paid from the public funds of Athens in the fifth century B.C.

συνέβαιναν γὰρ ἀπὸ τῶν φόρων καὶ τῶν τελῶν
καὶ τῶν συμμάχων πλείους ἢ δισμυρίους ἄνδρας
τρέφεσθαι. δικασταὶ μὲν γὰρ ἦσαν
ἑξακισχίλιοι κ.τ.λ.

True, there is not a word about this figure 6,000 for the dikasts in the second part of the treatise, where the annual composition of the great panel, as well as the diurnal sortition of particular juries, is somewhat minutely displayed. True, the description of the dikastic institutions as they were in the days of Demosthenes and Aristotle, for which the second part of the 'Ἀθηναίων πολιτεία' is a first-rate authority, completely vindicates Max Fraenkel's brilliant critique. But the express text above quoted is too much for Dr. Gilbert, with his generous estimate of 'Aristotle's' authority for the history of Athenian institutions. Accordingly Gilbert—while of necessity abandoning the position for the fourth century—positively retains, or, to speak more accurately, revives the exploded theory of Valesius, with the further developments of Matthiae (*de iudiciis Atheniensium*), and of Schoemann (*de sortitione iudicum apud Athenienses*), as valid for the fifth century B.C. (See *Eng. Trans.* pp. 391, 392, 394.)

There is thus set up a notable contrast between the *album iudicum* of the fifth century and that of the fourth, but it is an absolutely unnecessary and untenable contrast. Every argument against the 6,000 remains exactly where it was before the 'Ἀθηναίων πολιτεία' came to light. There is not space here to recapitulate or to enforce those arguments, I must be content to say that if they are valid against the contemporary authority of Aristophanes in the fifth century, they are valid against the fourth century writer—even assuming the complete authenticity of the given passage in the 'Ἀθηναίων πολιτεία'. The figures in this passage are obviously round numbers—the 500 *φρουροὶ νεωρίων*, the 700 *ἀρχαὶ ἐνδημοὶ* and so forth—and the 6,000 dikasts cannot be seriously treated as a fixed and absolute total obtained, year by year, by some method not specified or even suggested anywhere in the treatise. Nor is the figure adduced in order to elucidate the composition of the *album iudicum*, or of the special juries; it is given simply as an item in the grand total of state-paid Athenians, 'upwards of 20,000,' in all. And where can we suppose the author to have got these figures from? Where did he find the 6,000 dikasts? He found the 6,000 dikasts where Valesius found them, to wit, in the *Wasps* of Aristophanes. He found them where he himself found the 20,000 citizens—it is a mercy that he has spared us the 1,000 tributary cities!

εἰσὶν γε πόλεις χίλια, αἱ νῦν τὸν φόρον ἡμῖν
ἀπάγουσιν
τούτων εἴκοσιν ἄνδρας βόσκειν εἴ τις προστάξεν
ἐκάστην,
δύο μυριάδες τῶν δημοτικῶν ἔζων ἐν πᾶσι
λαγύοις...

Wasps 707-9.

If 'the *φόροι* and the *σύμμαχοι*' can support 20,000 Athenians, you have but to add the *τέλη* to support the more!

The case is fairly clear. We are in the presence of one of those inferences and combinations of which the first part of the 'Ἀθην. πολ.' is full; we are not in the presence of an official document, or a genuine tradition. Some of these inferences are good, and some of them are bad, and some in either kind have been independently made by modern scholars, before the discovery of the 'Ἀθηναίων πολιτεία'. The 'Ἀθηναίων πολιτεία' has appeared to verify the modern conjectures: but the apparent verification is not above criticism. Luge-

bil's theory on the position of the Polemarch at Marathon is a good case in point. Every one now accepts this theory, on the strength of the 'Αθηναίων πολιτεία, yet the theory was fully established, for those who could estimate historic evidence, long before the recovery of the 'Αθηναίων πολιτεία.¹ But this other case—the apparent verification of the hypothesis of Valesius in the text of the 'Αθηναίων πολιτεία—only proves, when critically examined, that a bad inference made in the seventeenth century of our era had been anticipated in the

¹ On this point I venture to refer to the note in my edition of Herodotus iv., v., vi. Vol. i. p. 365.

fourth century before our era. It is a subject for regret that Dr. Gilbert has allowed himself to be overborne by the authority of the 'Αθηναίων πολιτεία in this matter; and I trust he will reconsider his position before the next edition of his *Handbuch* makes its appearance. The classical perfection which he has attained in the treatment of the Constitutional Antiquities of Sparta and Athens makes any lapse on his part the more distressing to those who, like the present writer, gratefully acknowledge a large debt to his labours.

REGINALD W. MACAN.

RAMSAY'S *ST. PAUL THE TRAVELLER AND THE ROMAN CITIZEN*.

St. Paul the Traveller and the Roman Citizen, by PROFESSOR RAMSAY. 1895. 10s. 6d.

THE record of St. Paul's Christian life in the Acts ranges from his conversion to his Roman imprisonment: but his active career as apostle to the Gentiles (omitting the unrecorded years at Tarsus, and his last years of which mere glimpses are given in the Pastoral Epistles) began with his arrival at Antioch and ended with his arrest at Jerusalem. Other periods of his life are rich in personal and spiritual interest: but these were the years in which he took the lead in church extension. His rapid success claims the attention of the philosophic historian as well as the Christian: within fifteen years he planted churches throughout Asiatic and European Greece which lived, and took root, and grew into a permanent kingdom of Christ. This was evidently due to certain elements in his Greek environment which rendered it possible for him to make Greek culture and Roman organization valuable handmaids of the Church. These elements may with advantage be considered in connexion with his many-sided character, and his wonderful combination in his own person of the various forces that made up the complex civilization around him. He was by birth and education at once Jew Greek and Roman before he became a Christian apostle. The union of Jew and Greek was specially important: for by opening to him the synagogues of the Dispersion it enabled him, in spite of the Jewish opposition which his doctrine

provoked, to win the ear of those godfearing Gentiles who offered the most fruitful field for conversion. His Roman citizenship also had its value, as Prof. Ramsay urges in his recent work on *St. Paul the Traveller and the Roman Citizen*, not only as a shield from outward danger, but also in the wide outlook it gave him over the Empire, and a greater sympathy with Imperial organization than was possessed by mere provincials.

For, as the author points out, the civilization of Greece and Western Asia was Graeco-Roman. Greeks had of old studded the seaboard with colonies, which found in the ordered freedom of city life the most effectual means of commercial enterprise and of protection against oriental despotism. Greek monarchs had further developed this municipal system as the surest support of their throne against the reactionary forces of Eastern feudalism and superstition, besides adding to the cities a large Jewish population. The Caesars, inheriting a like policy from the Roman Senate, fostered the growth of commercial cities and established new colonies along the main lines of communication.

This Graeco-Roman civilization has found few more able exponents than Prof. Ramsay. By local research, by study of its geography and its monuments, by investigation of its political changes and its history, he has made himself well acquainted with the religious and social life of Asia Minor during the first two centuries. His history of *The Church in the Roman Empire* in-

volved a careful scrutiny of the latter half of the Acts—the *travel-document* as he there entitles it—which contains the record of St. Paul's mission to the Gentiles: and he there pronounced it unquestionably an original document of the first century, but cautiously reserved his opinion as to the earlier chapters, which were composed under different circumstances without personal knowledge of the facts. In his later volume he abandons this attitude of reserve, upholds the unity of the whole book, and ascribes its authorship to Luke the companion of St. Paul. This is an encouraging symptom of a healthy reaction in modern criticism against the absurdity of reducing this noble record of a living church, stamped throughout in spirit as well as style and language with the seal of unity, into a stale patchwork of old documents. This protest against scissors-and-paste theories comes with special force from an author who has rendered such good service in rehabilitating its character as contemporary history.

In fixing its date however he scarcely manifests the courage of his opinions. Though he dates all the travel-notes between 43 and 60, and the chapters which contain them consist almost wholly of travel-notes, and are instinct with their life and freshness; and though the materials of the earlier chapters were obviously within the author's reach before he left Palestine in 59; he postpones the final composition more than twenty years till the reign of Domitian. In support of this date he merely adduces one ingenious argument, which might create a presumption, if it were more convincing than it is, that the joint rule of Titus had begun in 71 before the completion of the Third Gospel. But his own account of the Flavian policy condemns the date he now suggests for the Acts. Domitian, as he has forcibly argued, inherited his policy from his father and brother; though the cruelty which drenched the Flavian amphitheatre with Christian blood was peculiarly his own. The Flavian throne rested on a popular basis, and Christians had become by the time of Nero a most unpopular class of social revolutionaries in the eyes of the Roman populace. Caesar-worship reached its climax under Domitian, but the Jewish war first accentuated the dangers of a kindred faith; and the antichristian policy of the Flavian emperors, which aimed at stamping out the name of Christ by the capital punishment of apostles and saints, cannot have been

long delayed after their triumph. That crisis reversed the face of the religious world. Jews became no longer formidable persecutors, as they are presented in the Acts, but downtrodden exiles from city and temple; Rome no longer the protector of the Church, but a jealous tyrant.

The later chapters of the biography contain little new matter; though most readers will welcome the excellent *résumé* of James Smith's exhaustive and masterly treatise on the voyage to Rome and shipwreck: and the account given of the Imperial police system for the custody of state prisoners will be new to many. Its chief interest centres in the earlier life. The sojourn at Athens gains some touches of reality from the lively picture of an ancient university and its surroundings: the topography of the Areopagus is handled with the true instinct of an archaeologist as an effective argument against the conception of a popular address from the hill. Still more valuable are the travel-notes in Asia Minor. The author's intimate acquaintance with its internal condition under the Caesars makes his remarks on that region extremely valuable. He has succeeded to the satisfaction of most dispassionate inquirers in disproving the theory of the late Bishop Lightfoot that the Galatian churches of St. Paul were planted in the cities of Northern Galatia; to which English churchmen have clung in loyal deference to his high authority, though it made it almost impossible to reconcile the Epistle with the Acts.

His description of Roman policy and Graeco-Roman civilization brings out effectively the bright side of Imperial rule. The reign of law and order established in the city centres, and along the main roads, the fairly evenhanded justice, the stern repression of violence, the road-making and vigorous police, made it a valuable ally of Christianity as a civilizing agent in the apostolic age; more than thirty years of church life elapsed before the Emperors learned to dread the spiritual power and organized unity of the Church, and sought to crush by force so formidable an antagonist to centralized despotism and social tyranny.

The picture of St. Paul's environment at Ephesus is a little disappointing to those who know *The Church in the Roman Empire*, because it omits the graphic account of the famous temple of Great Artemis, fruitful goddess-mother and nurse of life, with its throng of votaries from all lands, the exten-

sive traffic that grew up around it, and the demand for shrines in silver marble and terracotta. But the mercenary motives of the craftsmen are faithfully depicted, as well as the absence of sincere fanaticism in the opposition to St. Paul, and the friendly tone of the upper classes, represented by the Imperial commissioners of religious worship.

I cannot however endorse the author's view of the relations of the apostles with the synagogue. The statement that Peter laid it down as a necessary condition of reception into the Church that the non-Jew must approach by way of the synagogue, appears to me quite groundless. *Cornelius* was not a proselyte, as is affirmed, but a godfearing Gentile who attended the synagogue he had built and observed Jewish hours of prayer: nor was the question presented to Peter one of *Hebrew birth as a necessary condition of membership of the Church*, but of circumcision. Proselytes had been freely invited at Pentecost to join the Church (Acts ii. 10), and one of the Seven was a proselyte. The baptism of Cornelius with the Spirit was on the contrary the fundamental charter of Gentile Christians. Hitherto the apostles had regarded the uncircumcised as unclean: for Christ himself had pointedly refused with seeming harshness to admit Gentiles to the blessings of the Gospel. But now God revealed to St. Peter and the Church his new covenant with the uncircumcised.

On the other hand the chief secret of St. Paul's success lay in his power over the large body of godfearing Gentiles within the synagogue: they became his enthusiastic adherents, and formed, as his Epistles attest, the strength of the Pauline churches. The author represents St. Paul as addressing himself in Galatia to the pagan populace; but the Epistle to his Galatian converts is saturated through and through with Old Testament thoughts and language, and was clearly addressed to pupils of the synagogue. Again in Thessalonica the author rejects the authority of the great MSS. in Acts xvii. 4, in support of his view that the great sphere of St. Paul's influence was outside the synagogue. But the first distinct breach with the synagogue recorded in the Acts was at Corinth: and even there, as his First Epistle to the Corinthian church declares, his converts were learned in the Scriptures, having doubtless followed him out of the synagogue.

This volume does not claim to be a critical edition and it would be unjust to condemn

it on critical grounds: but the hasty rejection of the great MSS. whenever a difficulty confronts us, or a valuable comment has crept from the margin into a later text, calls for protest. Three instances must suffice. The reading *εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ* in xii. 25 is summarily dismissed as *impossible*. Why so? it has to be coupled with *πληρώσαντες*, and its position is therefore unusual: transcribers have stumbled over it, changing *εἰς* into a barely possible *ἐξ*, and correcting that into *ἀπό*, but the context goes far to justify it. In returning from the Caesarean episode to the mission of Barnabas and Saul it is reasonable to mark the change of scene by giving prominence to Jerusalem, as the place of their ministry.—In xvi. 6 the reading of the great MSS. *Διήλθον... κωλυθέντες*, though it makes excellent sense and perfect Greek, if literally translated, is set aside in favour of the hopeless jumble of participles in the Received Text, because the author finds it difficult to reconcile it with his view of the context.—In xxviii. 16 the marginal note recording the delivery of St. Paul into the custody of the head of the detective police is a valuable fragment of antiquity, but its absence from the oldest MSS. forbids its acceptance as a genuine clause of the original text, and it is difficult to understand the suggestion that it was omitted because it *had only a mundane interest*.

In the domain of church history I am grieved to differ so widely from the author. His description of the first mission of Barnabas and Saul to Jerusalem contradicts apparently the original record. We are told in the Acts that the Christians of Antioch, being stirred by a prophecy of impending famine to send relief to the brethren in Judaea, sent it to the elders by the hand of Barnabas and Saul. The obvious inference is that the office of relieving the Christian poor which had been performed by the apostles, and for a time by the Seven, devolved at that time upon the elders, and that the duty of Barnabas and Saul ended with placing the contribution in their hands, just as the more important Pauline contribution was afterwards presented to James and the elders. Prof. Ramsay however sets aside the elders, and maintains that Saul—whose life, as a hated renegade, was never safe in Jerusalem—repaired thither with Barnabas and a staff of assistants, forsaking their ministry at Antioch for some months, that they might purchase and distribute food to the starving poor at Jerusalem. In support of this strange contention he urges

that the conveyance of alms could not be designated as a *διακονία*, though the mere contribution is so entitled in 2 Cor. ix. 1. The mission is also dated in the Acts by the outbreak of the Herodian persecution *at that time* (not *about*, for the Greek preposition used in xii. 1 is *κατά*): yet Prof. Ramsay makes them wait two whole years till the occurrence of actual famine about 46. His object in these suggestions is to identify the conference of Barnabas and Saul related in Gal. ii. 1-10, and there dated thirteen years after Saul's conversion, with this visit. For the persecution began within fourteen years after the Crucifixion, and the conference was well-nigh impossible at a time when Herod was marking down the leaders of the Church as victims, and they were seeking safety in flight or concealment. Prof. Ramsay indeed scouts this idea as unworthy of apostles: but their Lord had enjoined flight from persecution, and St. Paul practised it again and again, little as he feared to die.

In pursuance of the same theory he interposes ten years of misdirected and comparatively barren ministry at Tarsus between Saul's successful preaching at Damascus and the wonderful triumphs of his subsequent career; he dates the recognition of Barnabas and Saul by Peter James and John, as God's chosen apostles for the conversion of the Gentiles, before their commission from the church of Antioch, and before the vision which revealed to Saul his future mission; besides postponing that vision till eleven years after Saul's flight from Jerusalem. It is not easy to conceive a more complete dislocation of his Christian career.

His view of Gal. ii. 1-10 as relating a private understanding between the leaders rests on his interpretation of *τοῖς δοκοῦσι* in v. 2 as *the leading spirits* of the Twelve, and assumes their identity with Peter James and John, whereas I understand the Greek text of vv. 7-9 *ἀλλὰ τοὐναντίον*...as emphatically contrasting the conduct of the two. But the passage is confessedly obscure, and I should hardly refer to it, were it not for the suggestion that St. Paul made a formal

submission to the subsequent council in reliance on this private understanding. This is to introduce into the apostolic government a fatal atmosphere of intrigue, which savours more of the nineteenth century than of the first.

He treats of the council as *a recognition that Jerusalem was the administrative centre of the Church*, adopting the false analogy of general councils, representative of the whole Church and armed with imperial authority. I find in the Acts no appearance of representation or authority over the Gentile churches. The church of Antioch sent ambassadors to Jerusalem to complain of an agitation raised by Jewish Christians at Antioch. These obtained from the apostles and local elders an emphatic repudiation of the unauthorized agitators, and a distinct recognition of Gentile freedom from the Law. They took back with them a letter from the elder brethren to their Gentile brethren, settling the terms on which Jewish Christians, bound by the law of Moses, might nevertheless maintain communion with Gentile brethren. I find here no trace of submission, no surrender of independence, but a treaty of brotherly alliance between two distinct sections of the Church, concluded by the Twelve and the elders on the one part, and by Barnabas and Paul on the other. Submission on the part of St. Paul would be quite inconsistent with his jealous vindication of his own apostolic authority in all his Epistles. The assertion that *his whole history shows that he recognized Jerusalem as the administrative centre of the Church* simply amazes me. Even the mother-church of Antioch passed gradually out of sight, as he pressed onward in his apostolic career, grouping his churches round new centres, cementing them together by common action, straining to add West to East. He was indeed most anxious to avoid a rupture with Jerusalem, which would have broken the unity of the Church, but I cannot conceive him looking back to a Jewish centre of Gentile Christianity.

F. RENDALL.

LEO'S PLAUTINISCHE FORSCHUNGEN.

Plautinische Forschungen zur Kritik und Geschichte der Komödie, von FR. LEO. (Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, pp. viii. 346.) Berlin. 1895. 13 M.

PROFESSOR LEO'S *Forschungen* is the most important work on Plautus that has appeared since Ritschl's *Prolegomena*. The number of new suggestions which it offers is so great that it is impossible for a reviewer to treat the whole work in detail. Of the last five of the six chapters into which it is divided, I will only say that chaps. ii. iii. and iv., which deal with the Biography of Plautus, his Greek originals and the genuineness of the Prologues of his plays, are perhaps the most valuable part of this valuable volume and will meet with the most ready acceptance. In chap. v. the case for Prof. Leo's theory of the elision of final *-s* after a short vowel before an initial vowel in Plautus is stated with so strong an array of facts as to make me ashamed of my scant recognition of this theory in the *Latin Language* (ch. ii. § 137, p. 123); and the whole question of the dropping of final *-s* in Latin is thoroughly investigated. Chap. vi. contains the brilliant discovery that *-ae* of the Gen. Sg. (originally a disyllable *-āi*) is treated differently by early poets from *-ae* of the Dat. (Loc.) Sg. (originally a long diphthong *-āi*) in that Synaloephe of Gen. *-ae* is avoided.¹ But since every one who takes an interest in Plautus must get and read this book for himself, I prefer to use the space at my disposal in a fuller discussion of the chapter which has the most importance for the restoration of the text of Plautus, I mean chap. i. which deals with the history of the Plautine Text in antiquity.

It has for a long time been known that our text must have come ultimately from actors' copies; and various readings have been with more or less probability referred to the changes which would have to be made at the Plautine revival in the first century B.C., in order to make the meaning and metre intelligible to the audience. Thus

¹ Philologists owe gratitude to Prof. Leo for this interesting proof of the different course of development taken by these two case-endings, and will forgive him for his strange explanations of *Pomplio* as a Dual (p. 333) and of Gen. *-āi* from *-ās* like Ital. *crai* from *crās* (p. 321n.).

The elision of the *-ae* of *meae* in *Epid.* 563 *dōmi meae ecam sātum* need cause no difficulty. *Meae* is a Locative,

the substitution in our MSS. of *purgitant* for the Plautine *purigant* in *Aul.* 753:

nōn mi homines placēt qui quando māle fecerunt purigant,

is claimed for this period; for, it is argued, a later scribe would merely replace the obsolete *purigant* by the familiar *purgant* without troubling himself to preserve the metre (cf. *Truc.* 245 *demum oggerunt* (*A*) for *demus danunt* (*P*); *Pseud.* 432 *forsitan ea tibi* (*P*) for *fors fuat an istaec* (*A*). Further, that corruptions existed in the Plautine text as early as Varro's time is known not only from his mention in the *Lingua Latina* ix. 61, 106 of the corruption *lauari* for *lauare* in *Truc.* 323, but also from Festus' account of his explanation of *Curc.* 568, which shows that the text used by Varro had *uapula ergo* instead of *uapulare ergo*. It is then a perfectly natural supposition that in the first complete edition of the twenty-one plays, an edition from which both the fourth century Ambrosian Palimpsest (*A*) and the Archetype of our other MSS. (*P*) are derived, there were errors which were transmitted to both families of MSS. Indeed Schoell has gone so far as to argue from certain lacunae, which he professes to find in both *A* and *P*, that the common original had holes in certain pages and that each page contained a certain number of lines. It is therefore no new theory which Prof. Leo brings before us in the first chapter, where he emphasizes the significance of these corruptions common to *A* and *P*. What is new is his conjecture (I say conjecture, for the facts are too uncertain to admit of proof) that this original edition of the twenty-one plays was comparatively late, only a century or two earlier than the Ambrosian Palimpsest itself, belonging to the second century A.D., and being a product of the Archaic Revival of that period. The theory of that time, he says,—a theory which we find carried into practice in contemporary inscriptions,—that hiatus was allowable in verse, induced the editor or editors of Plautus to leave unemended such lines as exhibited hiatus; so that passages like *Poen.* 453-6 (*AP*):

sex immolauī | āgnos nec potui tamen
propitiā Venerem facere uti | esset mihi.
Quoniam litare nequeo abii illum flico
iratus : uotui | exta prosicariet,

reproduce the Plautine text of the first edition, in other words, the high-water mark beyond which Plautine students of to-day can hardly expect to pass. Prof. Leo draws up a long list of lines in which hiatus is exhibited in the *A* and the *P* versions, and supposes them one and all to have stood in this form in the original edition, an edition referred by him to some period after Probus, by others to some period after Varro. The list is an alarming one; and Prof. Leo's whole theory is likely to have something of a paralysing effect on Plautine emendation, to suggest tacit acquiescence in MS. corruptions rather than a vigorous effort to get past and beyond them to the actual words of Plautus.

And yet it seems to me that the time has not yet come for such a policy of despair. The whole history of Plautine emendation has shown us that the canon of textual criticism which has led to success is that the readings common to *A* and *P* are to be accepted as the right readings, unless it can be shown that the mistake is one into which the scribe of *A* and the *P* scribe may have fallen independently. There are several considerations which should prevent us from abandoning this canon, found so useful in the past.

Prof. Leo's list of lines, similarly worded in both *A* and *P*, in which the laws of scansion, as they are known to us, are violated, is, as I have said, a long one. But it would have been a good deal longer, if the list had been compiled a few years ago, prior to Skutsch's clever discovery that the final vowel of *-que*, *-ne* was dropped in conversational Latin, and therefore in the versification of Plautus, in other words besides *atque* (*ac*), *neque* (*nec*), *viden*, &c. Skutsch made that discovery by observing that *A* and *P* agreed in presenting a large number of lines of this form:—

Poen. 419 *perque meos amores pérque Adelphasiúm meum* (Iamb. Senar.)

which violated our ordinary rules of scansion. But rightly judging that, where *A* and *P* agreed about a reading, that reading would probably be correct, he looked about for an explanation of the apparent irregularity, and discovered this law of Latin pronunciation. Has not Prof. Leo himself in the last chapter of this book removed from the list of 'corruptions common to *A* and *P*' all those lines in which *-ae* of the Gen. Sg. stands in hiatus, by showing that

the pronunciation of this diphthong in Plautus' age was of a kind that enabled it to stand before an initial vowel without causing hiatus? And we do not find in his list *Poen.* 388:

húius cor, huiús studium, huius sáuium, mastígia,

now that Buecheler, accepting the common reading of *A* and *P*, has shown that there is no corruption, but that *cor* in the time of Plautus was a syllable long by position. We are then entitled to believe that before many years are passed Prof. Leo's list will be considerably reduced by new discoveries about Plautine pronunciation and prosody.

Even now we can diminish it by the consideration, surely a very natural one, that since the same tendencies to error were present to the ancient scribe of *A* as to the mediaeval scribes of 'Palatine' MSS., they must occasionally have fallen into the same mistake. Thus the scribe of *A* is, like all scribes, inclined to Haplography, and writes, e.g. *quemquam* for *quemquam quam* in *Most.* 608. The scribes of the 'Palatine' MSS. are inclined to the same error, and write, e.g. *uisita sit* for *uisitata sit* in *Trin.* 766. We need not then suppose *gerere* <re>m of *AP* in *Trin.* 773 to be a corruption that existed in the first MS. of Plautus. It may well have crept into *A* and into some *P*-archetype independently. In *Stich.* 289 *CD* have the same error as *A*, *hamum* for *hamulum*; but the fact that *B* has *hamulum* shows us that the mistake is one for which the scribe of *A* on the one hand, and the scribe of the original of *C* and *D* on the other are responsible, and which must not be foisted into the original of *AP*. And yet how many lines must be in the same case, while the needed indication is lacking! *Poen.* 388-90 with their numerous homoeoteleutons, or rather homoeoarchons, offer a regular pitfall to scribes; and as a matter of fact the scribes of *ABCD* have all gone wrong in this passage; but luckily they have gone wrong at different parts and in different ways so that the common archetype of *A* and *P* for once escapes being saddled with the responsibility for the error. Or, again, Transposition is a common fault of the scribe of *A*, as in the *Stichus* at v. 350 &c. It is also a common fault of the 'Palatine' scribes, as in the same play at vv. 117, 293, 295, &c. What wonder then that *A* and the 'Palatine' MSS. coincide in one of the instances of transposition in this play (v. 275), or in so

natural a transposition as in *Pseud.* 997, where the true reading: *propera pellegere ergo epistulam* has become in both families of MSS. *propera pellegere epistulam ergo*? The same considerations may make us pause before we assign to the original edition of Plautus every mistake that is found at once in a line of the 'Palatine' text and in the same line as quoted by Nonius. Our MSS. of Nonius, as I have tried to show in the *Philologus* of this year, are all derived from a single MS. of the eighth or ninth century, and only in Books i.—iii. have we readings of a seventh or eighth century archetype. The writer of this MS. or the writer of its parent archetype may quite conceivably have fallen on his own account into the same error as a 'Palatine' scribe, if the error is a natural one to fall into, e.g. *Asin.* 807 *puras* for *pure*. On the other hand the quotation of a line by Nonius or some other grammarian often affords the very proof we need and shows us that a corruption common to *A* with the 'Palatine' MSS. was not necessarily a corruption of the first edition of Plautus. For example, in *Mil.* 1413 *A* has *mittemus*, *BCD* *mittimus*; but the Priscian MSS. have *amittimus*, a fact which argues for the true reading *amittimus* having been the reading of the early Plautine text.

And is there not a further possibility with regard to the consensus in error of *A* and the 'Palatine' MSS., viz. that some early 'Palatine' archetype was provided with the record of readings of the 'Ambrosian' family? These readings, entered in the margin of this archetype or between the lines, might be allowed by subsequent copyists to oust the original 'Palatine' readings. There are many indications that the early 'Palatine' MSS. contained variants, interlinear and marginal; and while it is possible and in many cases probable that these variants existed in the common archetype of *A* and *P*, it is also possible that they were often introduced at a later period into the *P* text from *A*. Even the appearance of the same gloss in *A* and in *P* MSS. is not proof positive that this gloss had been written in the common archetype of *A* and *P*. There were stock glosses for certain words; and these stock glosses may have found their way as explanations of these words into *A* and into *P* at different times. Thus *rogo* is the stock or standard gloss of O. Lat. *oro* and has ousted the O. Lat. word in *Pers.* 321 in *P* (*quod me dudum rogasti*), but not in *A* (*quod mecum dudum orasti*); in *Mos.* 682 it has ousted

oro in *A* (*bonum aequumque rogas*), but not in *P* (*bonum aequumque oras*). Similarly with *simul* for *simitu*, *tui* for *tis*, &c. A scribe at any time might explain the old word by its modern equivalent; so that the appearance of the modern equivalent instead of the Plautine word in both the Ambrosian and the Palatine text does not warrant the conclusion that the gloss had already supplanted the archaism in the common original of *A* and *P*.

All these considerations should, I think, keep us from being overmuch alarmed by the list of apparent corruptions in the first edition of the twenty-one plays. Before we accept it, we must first assure ourselves that the corruption has not insinuated itself into the 'Palatine' text at a later date; and I think that if we make a closer investigation into the immediate archetype of our existing Palatine MSS., an archetype referred by general consensus to the eighth or ninth century, we shall find that it was surprisingly free from a large number of errors which appear in our minuscule MSS. and which get the credit of having belonged to the proto-archetype (*P*). And we must also assure ourselves that what is called a corruption is really a corruption. How many of the cases of hiatus quoted by Prof. Leo are really metrical blemishes of Plautine verse, is by no means easy to decide. The last word on hiatus has not yet been spoken; and I for my part do not see how Cicero's statement about the 'antiqui poetae,' that they 'saepe hiabant,' is to be set aside. The most recent investigations into the Saturnian Metre have increased the likelihood that prosodical hiatus was found to a very large extent in primitive Latin verse. Prof. Leo, who still clings to the old-fashioned 'quantitative' theory of the Saturnians, has ignored this fact, and prefers to set aside Cicero's statement as a mere mistake, due to his having a text of the early writers in which old forms like *med*, *ted*, *sed* appeared as *me*, *te*, *se*, &c., with consequent hiatus. But the actual instances quoted by Cicero cannot be explained away in this fashion, nor yet the statements of other grammarians about such scansion of Ennius as *militum octo*. The truth is that we have yet to learn under what circumstances prosodical hiatus was legitimate in early Latin poetry; and it is not allowable to seize upon each and every example of a hiatus in our two texts of Plautus as an instance of a corruption in the text. Both in cases of hiatus and of other apparent corruptions

common to the *A* and the *P* texts it will be a safer policy for us to accept them as genuine and try to find an explanation of them than to label them without further effort as

corruptions which existed in the first edition of the twenty-one plays.

W. M. LINDSAY.

SCHWAB'S SYNTAX OF THE GREEK COMPARATIVE.

Historische Syntax der griechischen Comparison in der klassischen Literatur, von OTTO SCHWAB. Heft 2. Würzburg, 1894. Pp. 180. 5 Mk.

In the *Classical Review* for December, 1894, pp. 454—459, I reviewed a first instalment of this treatise. The second instalment, which forms Heft 12 of Schanz's *Beiträge*, deals with 'rising Comparison' (*steigernde Comparison*). I need not here repeat my strictures on 'adversative Comparison' save to note in general that Schwab appeals to his tenet of $\tilde{\eta} = \delta\lambda\lambda'$ $\sigma\tilde{\iota}$ to explain several of the categories in this part of his essay.

Theory aside, the conclusions Schwab draws from a statistical study of the Greek comparative amply confirm what seems to be proved for the Aryan genesis of the comparative, viz. its construction with a separative case. It is gratifying therefore to quote from Schwab (p. 2): '*Nie ist $\tilde{\eta}$ ausschliesslich oder auch nur in unbedingt bevorzugtem numerischen Verhältnisse gebraucht, wo der Genitiv stehen könnte.*'

Exceptions might be taken to one of the categories, where the so-called 'anomalous' comparatives *κρείττων* etc. are said to have maintained their *original* (i.e. 'adversative') character even in 'rising comparison.' Is it thereby implied that these comparatives are more archaic than those in *-τερος*? The suffix *-tero*, however, has comparative force in all the Aryan languages. It would seem that it must have had it in the Aryan period. Still doubt arises because in Rig Veda *-tara-* is practically limited to pronoun stems.

This limitation need not, however, bring into uncertainty the identification of the comparative and agential suffixes *tara* and *tar* as suggested in the first review. Ultimately both the comparative suffixes *-yan-s-* and *tara* go back to demonstrative agglutinative groups,¹ and we can hardly

¹ This does not favour 'adversative comparison.' We can illustrate the up-growth of a denominative suffix for the comparative from a phrase like 'Compared with John (from <the standpoint of> John) James is the strong <one>.'

doubt the kinship of the suffix of Sk. *an-ya-*, and Lat. *al-io-* with the more fully developed *-ya-n-s-*. For the agential suffix *-tar-* I refer to my 'Agglutination and Adaptation' (*Am. Jr. Phil.* xv. 409 sq., and especially 434). But though *-tara-* cannot be called a living comparative suffix in Rig Veda, yet, inasmuch as the suffix in *-yan-s* retains participial value there as in no sister language, it is by no means certain that the Greek suffix *ίων* should be assigned a really more archaic force than *-τερο-*.

Our author is liable to the charge of some rather sanguine differentiation, e.g. after saying (p. 60) that the universal use of *πατρός* instead of $\tilde{\eta}$ *πατήρ* 'wohl an das national-ethische Moment des anerkannten familiären Vererbungsprinzips und die daraus sich ableitende rhetorische Wirkung des *πατρόθεν ἐπονομάζειν* erinnert,' he goes on to say that $\tilde{\eta}$ is used 'sobald nicht die individuelle Persönlichkeit bezw. eine nationale oder Familien-Generation, sondern der natürliche Gattungsbegriff *πατήρ* gemeint ist—gleichsam als ein bestätigendes argumentum ex contrario.' Now among the examples that he cites are the following out of the same sentence from Plato (*Krito*, 51 A) $\tilde{\eta}$ οὕτως εἰ σοφός, ὥστε λελθόν σε δι μητρός τε καὶ πατρός . . . τιμιώτερόν ἐστιν ἢ πατρίς . . .)(καὶ σέβεσθαι δεῖ καὶ μᾶλλον ὑπέκειν . . . πατρίδα χαλεπαίνουσιν ἢ πατέρα. But which of us is not liable, in our eagerness to make points, to admit rather trivial pleas in seeking to explain away what is not in accord with our theories?

The mode of presentation of the statistics does not make them available for the reviewer, but it has seemed to me in many cases that the genitive was used where no *real* demonstrative article² could stand, e.g. with reflexives, with the *comparatio proportionalis* (= 'too great for'), with proverbial comparison (*μέλιτος γλυκίων*), etc. As to the phrase *μείζω λόγου* etc., we are told (p. 13) that it never has the article, and no substantive in similar cases has in poetry,

² The nominalizing article with participles and infinitives and the article with abstract nouns are not really demonstrative.

barring Euripides only (for examples, v. p. 11). On the other hand, in a category where the article must stand (e.g. ὁδὸν αὐτὸν λόγος σοὶ τοῦ πρὶν εὐγενέστερος), the prose instances with ῆ almost equal those with the genitive (36 : 47, cf. p. 65), but even here poetry has the genitive without exception.

This state of affairs can be interpreted in favour of my suggestion in the first review that ῆ is for *ῆτ, a separative of a demonstrative along with the separative genitive. If the original type was comparison of two members of the same class (cf. *C.R.* viii. 454), e.g. ὁδὸν ὁ ἵππος *ῆτ (= τοῦτου τοῦ) ἵππου ὠκίον ἐστὶ 'this horse is swifter than this,' it might well be that as ῆ(τ) became formal it was omitted entirely in generic comparisons, but was not quite moribund in particular comparisons. Here the objection cannot be raised that we should then expect ῆ with the genitive in particular comparisons. If such examples existed they have

been edited out of texts (p. 126); still, taking an instance of *comparatio compendiaris* like Homer's line (Π 688) :—

ἀλλ' αἰεὶ τε Διὸς κρείσσων νόος ἥπερ ἀνδρῶν
as a type we should expect Διὸς κρείσσων νόος ἐστὶ ἥπερ ἀνδράσι and Ζεὺς κρείσσονα νόον ἔχει ἥπερ ἄνδρες. Out of the practical equivalence of ῆ + nom. in the last example with the separative ἀνδρῶν in generic use would have sprung the disappearance of ῆ + genitive in particular use.

It is only with the *a priori* principles of Schwab that I have to dissent. His essay has advanced Greek grammar beyond Krüger or Curtius or Kägi so far as the comparative is concerned. We must nevermore speak of the *genetivus comparationis* as a substitute for ῆ and the comparative but *vice versa*, and so comparative grammar is justified by esoteric grammar.

EDWIN W. FAY.

Lexington, Va.

STOLZ ON LATIN SOUNDS AND STEMS.

(1) *Einleitung und Lautlehre*, von FR. STOLZ. Leipzig: Teubner. 1894. Pp. xii. 364. 7 M.

(2) *Stammbildungslehre*, von FR. STOLZ. Leipzig: Teubner. 1895. Pp. vi. 342. 7 M.

(These form vol. i. of a projected *Historische Grammatik der lateinischen Sprache*, edited by Blase, Landgraf, Schmalz, Stolz, Thüssing, Wagener, and Weinhold.)

PROFESSOR STOLZ of Innsbrück University, the author of a useful little Summary of Latin (Comparative) Philology in the Iwan Müller series, has in the first of these books devoted some 280 pages, with 80 of Introduction, to an account of the phonetic laws of Latin. Bibliography plays a great part in this volume, as it did in the Summary; and certainly the conscientious thoroughness with which Prof. Stolz has searched out, found, and taken a note of every scrap that has been written in recent years on any point of Latin phonetics deserves all praise. Still one cannot help feeling that he suffers to some extent from the defects of his qualities. A great many monographs and magazine articles are mentioned which had better be ignored, and not a few of his pages read more like an enumeration of the theories that other writers have put forward

than a connected statement of his own view. His generosity in giving recognition to a large number of very doubtful etymologies diminishes that sense of security that one ought to have in reading a work of this kind; e.g. on page 161 *aemulus* is connected with *imago*, *confutare* with *fāturus*! Plautus and the older Latin writers have been better studied for this volume than they were for the Summary, though there is still some weakness in this quarter. Thus on p. 226 *cūcūlus* and on p. 253 *nicere* should not be quoted as Plautine forms. One meets too with an annoying number of false quantities, which cannot always be put down to printers' errors. We find *lūcrum* on p. 161, *rēgimen* on p. 230, *lūculentus* on p. 237, *tēgus* on p. 238, *sōpor* on p. 128 (cf. p. 211), and so on. But these can easily be removed in a second edition. When that second edition appears, I hope that Prof. Stolz will show more judicial severity than he has shown in this edition, and will sternly rule out every theory that does not fully establish its claim to recognition. To take an example, which cannot give offence, my own scansion of *integrum* in the Saturnian line of Naevius, although I believe it to be right, is not, in the absence of more certain evidence, worthy of the place which Prof. Stolz has given it on p. 101.

For Prof. Stolz's second section, on the

formation of Latin stems, I have nothing but praise. He has of course not exhausted the subject. It will take many years before any one can hope to do that. But he has advanced our knowledge far beyond the researches of Prof. Brugmann in this field, and his treatise is the best that we possess on this very difficult part of Latin philology. Every student of Latin should read it.

I will conclude my review with a mention of some points in which I differ from Prof. Stolz: p. 122 *ē* of *ceteri* cannot possibly represent L.-Eur. *ei*; p. 152 since *hoc* is the older form of *huc*, how can *huc* stand for **hoi-ce*? p. 164 *acupediū* is a doubtful form (see *Class. Rev.* v. p. 9); p. 209 that **Seturnus*

became *Sāturnus* by analogy of *sātor* can hardly be right; p. 213 *ei* on the S. C. de Bacchanalibus probably always represents the true diphthong: the *ei* of *inceideretis* is not then a mere graphical symbol of *ī*; p. 234 what evidence is there in Velius Longus that Lucilius wrote *ar me* and not *ad me*? p. 241 *offendimentum* is a 'ghost-word' (see my *Latin Language*, p. 272); p. 321 *derbiosus* may well be a late spelling of *derviosus*, so no argument can be founded on the *b*; p. 453 the Romance languages show that the first syllable of *russus* had *ū* not *ū*.

W. M. LINDSAY.

HALBERTSMA'S *ADVERSARIA CRITICA*.

Tjallingi Halbertsmae Adversaria Critica:
Eschedis defuncti selegit, disposuit, edidit
HENRICUS VAN HERWERDEN. Leidæ:
Brill. 1896. 5 Mk. nett.

THE name of T. Halbertsma is not unfamiliar to Greek scholars, as it is to be found occasionally occurring in the critical notes to more than one Greek author, and it is associated with an unfinished work on the characters mentioned by Aristophanes. The present volume consists of a series of corrections of the texts of various writers in both the classical languages, selected out of the deceased scholar's papers at his son-in-law's request by Professor van Herwerden, who has also added a brief memoir of the author. From this we learn that Halbertsma after studying under Bake and Cobet at Leyden, where he took his final degree in 1855, proceeded, after teaching for a few months at a private school, to a three years' tour in France, Italy and Spain, similar in character, though by no means similar in result, to that in which Cobet laid the foundations of his famous *Variae Lectiones*. Prof. van Herwerden has published a list of the MSS. which Halbertsma studied during this period. On his return he was appointed first master and afterwards headmaster of the gymnasium at Haarlem, which latter post he retained till 1877, when he was called to the Greek chair at Groningen. He died Midsummer 1894, aged 65 years. The affection of the eyes from which we are told that he suffered during the last twenty years of his life

perhaps accounts for the small extent of his writings.

It was, says the editor, Halbertsma's intention to collect and publish his conjectures when he retired from his Professorship, and so obtained the necessary leisure. These would seem to have been very numerous, as the *selection* which are contained in these 'Adversaria' concern a great variety of authors, both Greek and Latin, including some, the correction of whose texts is ordinarily left to rigid specialists, e.g. Homer, Aristotle, and Terence. A quarter of the volume, probably the best, deals with the Greek Historians and Orators; a fifth with the Attic Tragedians; and about a quarter with Latin writers. To criticize such a book would be the task of a whole jury of specialists; and to find fault would be more than ordinarily disagreeable in the case of a work never properly prepared for publication, and printed as a labour of love by the deceased author's friends. On the other hand, since there are no palaeographical observations, and no subtle studies of Greek or Latin usage, one could only *praise* the book by committing oneself to the approval of particular emendations; and this even the editor is unwilling to do. He says indeed that one emendation 'pleases him amazingly,' that of *Ion* 16

τεκοῦσ' ἐν οἴκοις παῖδ' ἀτήνεγκεν βρέφος,

where Halbertsma proposed to read

τεκοῦσ' ἐν οἴκοις λάθρ' ἀτήνεγκεν βρέφος.

But that this emendation is altogether impossible it does not require a Herwerden to see.

Although then the volume shows evidence of wide and careful reading, it is not probable that future editors of classical texts will find much in it that they can adopt. Conjectures however which have no critical probability are often of some help in introducing the student, so to speak, into the workshop of the writer, and suggesting reasons why one form of expression has been preferred to another that is more obvious; and for this purpose the book may be used with profit. Halbertsma suggests that in *Oed. Tyr.* 1376

ἀλλ' ἡ τέκνων δῆτ' ὄψις ἦν ἐφίμερος
βλαστοῦσ' ὅπως ἔβλαστε

we should read ἄβλασθ' ὅπως ἔβλαστε. Few will accept the correction; but it will help

some to see the difference between the language of poetry and prose. In Aristophanes, *Vesp.* 291 the children might (without harm to either metre or syntax) have said (p. 59) χαρίσαι' ἂν σὺ μοι οὖν, ὦ πάτερ, ἦν σοῦ τι δεηθῶ instead of ἐθελήσεις τι; the suggestion calls attention to the fact that the phrases used by coaxing children differ from those used by grown-up people. In the same play 999, πῶς οὖν ἐμαντῶ τοῦτ' ἐγὼ ξυνείσομαι, when we are told to read ξυγγνώσομαι, we may interpret this as a challenge to suggest a reason why the comic poet preferred an expression meaning 'how can I ever have it on my conscience?' to one meaning 'how can I ever forgive myself?' The emendations that have been quoted are illustrative of the whole volume, and our readers will be able to judge from them to what use they can put it.

D. S. MARGOLIOUTH.

LEAF AND BAYFIELD'S EDITION OF THE *ILIAD*.

The Iliad of Homer, edited by WALTER LEAF, Litt. D., and M. A. BAYFIELD, M.A. Vol. I. Books i.—xii. Pp. lxiv. +567, with 6 plates and 7 figs. in text. Fep. 8vo. Macmillan & Co.: London. 1895. 6s.

THE text in this excellent school edition is printed in 'Macmillan' type. The notes are based on those of Dr. Leaf's edition, and of his *Companion to the Iliad*. They are frequent and concise, and seem well suited for school use. There is a short grammatical introduction and appendices on (1) Homeric armour, (2) the Homeric use of μέλλω (from Mr. Platt's article in the *Journal of Philology*, no. 41), (3) the Homeric house, and (4) the Homeric chariot.

The appendix on armour is the chief novelty and the point most open to criticism, for the views of Dr. Reichel are adopted without reserve. Mr. Bayfield goes even further and gives two illustrations of the 'Homeric warrior fully armed,' and figures to show the structure of the shield. The warrior thus presented is far from imposing, especially in plate V., where he looks supremely uncomfortable and wears a melancholy expression. Schoolboys are scarcely likely to be impressed by this

up-to-date reconstruction and will prefer the warriors of the Attic vase-painters, which it has been the custom to place before them.

It is indeed a pity that Dr. Reichel's theories are so fully accepted. To state that the Homeric heroes wore no θώρηξ, and as a consequence to reject all the passages where it is mentioned as late interpolations, is by itself doubtful wisdom in an edition of the whole text. When one remembers that Hephaestus made a θώρηξ as well as a shield, and that the description of shield more nearly corresponds with the metal work of Mycenae than anything else in Homer, we stand amazed. To suggest that the 'making of the shield' is not Homeric is almost blasphemy.

Dr. Reichel's account of Mycenaean armour as shown by the monuments is excellent, if not exhaustive, but inferences from it must be taken for what they are worth. One of the weakest points in it is the fact that he has to explain away two of the clearest pieces of evidence yet found, the famous 'warrior' vase (Schuchhardt, figs. 284-5), and the two statuettes found by Tsountas (*Ephemeris Arch.* 1891, pl. 2). The vase is undoubtedly of a later date than most Mycenaean pottery, but, as it is the chief authority of the horns on the

helmet which Reichel identifies with *φάλοι*, it cannot be repudiated. Now the vase shows on one side warriors with a short shield which is only half the size of the typical Mycenaean shield, while on the other side, though the shields are large, one of them has a handle.

The two statuettes show a warrior hurling a spear with his right hand, and holding his left arm and hand in such a way that one is almost compelled to restore a buckler held, as in classical times, by an arm-strap and handle.

From an anthropological point of view Dr. Reichel's theory of the evolution of the shield seems certainly wrong.

The most primitive form is generally held to be elaborated from a parrying stick, not from a skin worn as a cloak (cf. *Catalogue* of Lane-Fox; now Pitt-Rivers Collection). Such shields with handles in the centre are shown in Egyptian wall-paintings and are common to this day among the spear-using tribes of Africa, in fact a Soudanese spearman with round hide buckler, dressed in loin-cloth and sandals, resembles a Mycenaean warrior except for the size of his shield. A further point is that the use of the strap (*τελαμών*) by no means excludes the use of the handle. It has always been adopted when the warrior wished to use both hands. Thus, the charioteers in black-figured vase-paintings (e.g. the old Corinthian 'Amphiaraus' vase at Berlin) frequently have shields hanging on their backs, just as the Turkish cavalry of the 15th century had (cf. Caorsini's woodcut of the battle with Prince Jem). The long heart-shaped shields of the Normans were also worn with a strap round the neck. For these reasons Dr. Reichel's conclusions that the big shield had no handle, only a baldrick, and that smaller shields were unknown seem to us extremely hazardous. He has been much influenced by the statement in Herodotus that the Greeks borrowed the invention of such handles (*ὄχαρα*) from the Carians, along with crests for their helmets and symbolic figures for their shields. Herodotus would no doubt have been much surprised if he could have guessed that his statements would be taken to apply to the period after the Dorian invasion. He is speaking of the age of Minos which, like Thucydides, he regards as earlier than the Trojan War. He would doubtless have

agreed with Thucydides (i. 8) in identifying the pre-historic weapons found on the islands with the Carian period, so that it is difficult to see the value of the passage in Herodotus as evidence.

Mr. Bayfield's figures showing the structure of the shield are interesting, but it is to be regretted that his experiments were made with buckram and not with raw hide. The shields of the Nubians, with high bosses formed without the aid of stays or straps, prove that hides properly treated may be easily made to take a given shape without the unsightly puckers of the buckram. It is noteworthy that fiddle-shaped and figure-of-eight shields are also to be found in Africa (cf. Lane-Fox, *Catalogue*, p. 13), the shape being apparently designed to allow the insertion of a spear on the inner side.

Dr. Reichel's argument from the absence of metal greaves in the graves at Mycenae is scarcely strong enough to make us relegate *χαλκοκνήμιδες* into the limbus of late interpolations. He holds that the greaves were merely gaiters to prevent the big shield bruising the shins. It seems rather strange that the one part unprotected by the shield should not have some armour. The old legend (cf. the Pembroke vase) of the death of Achilles by an arrow wound in the heel, and the fact that Paris in shooting at Diomedes selects the foot as a vulnerable spot (*Il.* xi. 276) seem to imply that higher up it was protected.

Mr. Bayfield's suggestion that the golden leg-guards or gaiter-holders found at Mycenae were *ἐπισφύρια* seems to be due to a misunderstanding of Reichel, who says (p. 76) that these leg-guards belonged to the upper part of the gaiter, holding it tight below the knee, and so imply the existence of other similar guards at the ankle below. These latter would be the *ἐπισφύρια*, but no specimens are extant.

These are a few criticisms of the appendix on the armour. Many more suggest themselves, but to enter into the vexed question of the helmet and minor points of interpretation would bring me beyond the modest limits of the review. One suggestion occurs to me—that the second volume should contain the figures from the 'warrior' vase and the statuettes referred to above, and that an appendix on Homeric dress, based on Studniczka, might be added.

W. C. F. ANDERSON.

EPIGRAMMATA

GEORGIO FREDERICO WATTS DEDICATA.

1.

Εἰς Ἔρωτα βίον ἀγωγόν.

Κεῖ κáμνονσι βροτοί, τό γε συγκάμνειν ἀγαπητόν·
ὦδε φίλον τὸ φιλεῖν, ὦδ' ἔρατεινός Ἔρως.

2.

Εἰς Ἔρωτα Θάνατον παραιτούμενον.

Οὐ κακὸν ὀρφναίη, κάσις ἡματος, εἰ καλὸν ἡμαρ·
εἰ δὲ καλὸν τὸ ζῆν, οὐ κακὸς ἔστ' Ἀΐδης.

3.

Εἰς Ἔρωτα ἀλιεύοντα.

Ἡὼθέν τ', ἀλιανθὲς Ἔρως, καὶ νεκτὸς ἐν αὐγαῖς
φαιδρὸς ἔτ' εἰ, στίλβων τήν κοβ' ὀμηλικήν.

4.

Εἰς παιδίον ἀωροθάνατον.

Ἡδύ, Θεός, τὸ ψυχίδιον καὶ ἄχραντον ἐδρέψω·
ἀνθεμίδ' ὥς χαρτῶν ἐν πτυχὶ σῶων ἔχοις.

5.

Εἰς Ἑλπίδα.

Μαντένουσ' Ἑλπίς, θείων πυλαωρὸς ὀνείρων,
φαντασίαις φοβερὰν εἶρξεν ἀπιστοσύνην.

6.

'Sic transit.'

Κτῆμα φίλον κέεται ζῶει θ' ὑπόγαιον ὅπισθεν
θησαύρισμα' ἀνδρῶν ἢ καλοκάγαθῶν.

GEORGE C. W. WARR.

1.

*Love and Life.*¹

Love is enow; life is not vain,
While hearts in woe of love are fain.

2.

Love and Death.

Fair is life's light, while love has breath,
And fair as night life's sister, death.

3.

Cupid fishing.

Love, the sea-born, is heavenly bright
From golden morn to azure night.

4.

Death crowning Innocence.

Souls without sin, that early slept,
As flowers within God's book are kept.

5.

Hope.

Hope's gate of horn turns doubt away
With dreams unborn till break of day.

6.

Sic transit.

As treasure stored within a grave,
The Earth doth hoard her good and brave.

GEORGE C. W. WARR.

¹ The English is reprinted, by the kind permission of the editor, from the *Academy* of Jan. 25.

NOTES ON THE *OECONOMICUS* OF XENOPHON.

(Classical Review, X. pp. 101, 144.)

Mr. H. RICHARDS in his interesting critical notes on the *Oeconomicus* of Xenophon professes to have taken my edition of 1894 as his main foundation. I am not aware of the existence of such an edition; the fourth and last impression from the plates of the original stereotyped edition appeared in 1889. I regret that he did not make use of the latest edition, printed and published in October, 1895; as he would then have spared himself the trouble of animadverting upon some errors that disfigured the earlier impressions.

Thus his notes on i 18, ii 7, ii 13, 15, 17, iv 4, v 18, vi 3, vii 43 in the March number, and in the April number on viii 10 (part), xi 18 (where *Cyr.* II ii 30

furnishes a parallel), xii 14 (where nothing is said in my last edition about *εὐπερές* and the mistranslation of *παρῆ* is not perpetuated, although by an unfortunate oversight the verb is misplaced in the Greek Index), xiii 9, xv 1 (where Mr. G. E. Marindin's suggestion of *κρίσις*, which he has proposed to me as an emendation, is far and away the best hitherto given), xvii 7 (where the punctuation suggested is adopted by me)—these all require to be re-written or altogether suppressed. In the remaining criticisms, Mr. Richards exhibits his usual acuteness and sound scholarship and commands my admiration and respect.

H. A. HOLDEN.

CORPUS POETARUM LATINORUM.

THE next fasciculus will contain the poets from Manilius to Valerius Flaccus, viz. Manilius, Phaedrus, Persius, Lucan, Valerius Flaccus together with the Aetna. The chief editor will be very grateful if scholars who have made recent contributions to the

textual criticism of these authors will acquaint him with the particulars in order that nothing may be overlooked. Communications may be addressed and pamphlets forwarded to Dr. J. P. Postgate, Trinity College, Cambridge.

ARCHAEOLOGY.

THE THRONE OF APOLLO AT
AMYKLAE.

ONE of the most interesting monuments of archaic art seen and described by Pausanias was the throne built for the Lacedaemonians by Bathycles of Magnesia as part of the furniture of the precinct of Apollo at Amyklæ. Not only does the list of subjects represented in the decorations which covered its sides furnish material for the study of mythography only equalled, in that period, by the chest of Kypselus: but the throne itself seems to have been in plan so skilfully adapted to meet the special

needs of its position, as to stand in an almost unique place in the history of Greek dedicatory art.

The interest attaching to the throne has naturally caused no little time to be spent in the endeavour to reconstruct it from the somewhat fragmentary account of Pausanias. The earlier writers—Heyne,¹ de Quincy,² Welcker,³ Brunn,⁴ Pyl,⁵ Bötticher,⁶ and

¹ *Antiquar. Anfs.* i. 1—115.² *Le Jupiter Olympien*, 196 ff.³ *Zeitschr. f. Gesch. d. a. Kunst.* 280 ff.⁴ *N. Rhein. Mus.* v. 325 ff.⁵ *Arch. Zeit.* 1852, 43.⁶ *id.* 1853, 59.

Rühl¹—may be classed together, as agreeing in the general principle of the restoration of the throne on the analogy of the ordinary seats supplied to Greek gods in artistic representations: while in the last few years Klein,² who is followed by Murray³ and Furtwängler,⁴ have gone further afield in search of models, and imagined the Amyklaean throne to be more like those of the Persian kings.

The excavation of the precinct at Amyklæ by Tsountas⁵ has supplied some fresh material, though unfortunately not such as to show decisively the shape of the throne. Of previous restorations, Furtwängler's alone has had the aid of this material; and if, as it is intended that this essay should show, he has misunderstood the meaning of it, this fact may justify a fresh attempt to solve the old problem.

To begin—as the builders began—with Apollo himself, the reason of the whole structure: the shape of the statue is fortunately known, as well from coins as from the description of Pausanias. It was of archaic style; a bronze pillar-like figure, with helmeted head, arms, the hands holding a spear and a bow, and feet: and, according to Pausanias, was not the work of Bathycles. There is no reason to doubt this statement: unless Bathycles had been specially commissioned to copy an older type, he would certainly not have chosen this form in which to represent the god: and it would seem incredible that such an elaborately peculiar throne should have been built to suit a newly-made and inconvenient deity, when it would have been so much simpler to make a seated statue according to the ordinary principles. The whole reason of the peculiar form of the throne, whatever restoration is adopted, lies in its being a later adjunct to an old statue, whose sanctity required it to be suited to his form. The Amyklaeans wished to provide Apollo with a seat: and, as he could not sit down, the seat had to be modified to accommodate him.

The basis upon which the statue stood was known as the grave of Hyakinthos; that is, it was the centre of the local hero-worship. The spot is shown, by the excavations of Tsountas, to have been sacred from the time when Amyklæ was in Achæan hands: and the so-called grave, or

rather altar, will have been originally erected then, and subsequently used as the basis for the statue of Apollo set up by the Dorian conquerors.

The question of the shape of this basis has been bound up with that of the general form of the throne by the discoveries of Tsountas and the arguments drawn therefrom by Furtwängler. These discoveries are, briefly, as follows. In the Amyklaean precinct were discovered a number of foundation-walls, of different dates: of which the oldest were, a semicircular wall, with a radius of about eighteen feet, as far as can be judged from the plan: and, within this, another wall, about sixteen feet long, cutting off the inmost segment of the semicircle. Of later, perhaps Roman, date are a wall at right angles to the second, built from its east end: a wall built across from end to end of the semicircle: and several fragments of walls outside the semicircle, but apparently built in relation to those inside. The space between the later east wall and the semicircular one is paved.

There seems every reason to suppose that the oldest walls belong to some part of the throne: the only question is, to which part. Tsountas suggested that the semicircular wall was the foundation of the throne, and the inner wall that of the basis. But this theory has been sufficiently refuted by Furtwängler, who has pointed out the impossibility of reconciling the words of Pausanias with a semicircular throne. He thinks that the semicircular wall—or semi-elliptical, as he prefers to call it—was the foundation of an originally elliptical altar, part of which was cut off, when the throne was built round it. The objection to this is, that it leaves the inner walls unexplained, unless it is to be supposed that there was a second building inside the altar, which Pausanias does not mention; that it also does not account for the pavement inside the semicircle; and that the throne must have covered the ground where Tsountas found remains of later walls, which were evidently built in relation to the throne, and therefore while it was standing—a thing impossible if Furtwängler's restoration were correct. According to the account which will be given below, the inner walls belonged to the throne: the semicircular wall was simply an enclosing barrier: and the outer walls probably belong to some Roman chapel or other building added to the precinct.

This will be found consistent with the shape and size of the throne. Klein

¹ *Arch. Zeit.* 1854, 70.

² *Mitth. Ost.* ix. 145.

³ *Hist. Greek Sculpt.* ed. 2.

⁴ *Meisterw. d. Griech. Plastik.*

⁵ *Εφ. Ἀρχαιολ.* 1891.

curiously argues that, because Pausanias persistently calls it a throne, earlier writers were wrong in supposing it to have been an ordinary Greek seat, and that it was a copy of a Persian throne. In emphasizing it as a real throne, Pausanias surely means that, despite the difficulties in the shape of Apollo, Bathykles had managed to give him what was just like all other thrones of the gods—Apollo had got a genuine throne, just as much as Zeus at Olympia. And the passage quoted in support of Klein's argument is really destructive of it. 'It is not possible,' says Pausanias, speaking of the throne of Zeus, 'to go under the throne, as we do under that at Amyklæ: for wall-like barriers block the way.' Now the manner of the barrier at Olympia, external to the throne, is known: and to suppose that the throne at Amyklæ consisted chiefly of three walls, like the barrier at Olympia, is entirely unsupported by Pausanias, who evidently speaks of this barrier as an adjunct not possessed by the throne at Amyklæ, and, it might fairly be argued, implies that the two thrones generally resembled each other otherwise. And it would be most natural for this shape to be chosen for the throne: it was the one most familiar to the Greeks in artistic representations of gods: it would be familiar to the Lacedæmonians, as this is the type found on the Spartan stelæ; and to Bathykles, if the 'Harpy tomb' may be taken as giving the form usual on the west coast of Asia Minor. It may be noted, in passing, that in these representations are found close parallels to the details of the Amyklæan throne chronicled by Pausanias: on the eastern side of the 'Harpy tomb' is to be seen a throne whose arm-rail is supported by a Triton, and along the bar beneath the seat is a floral decoration; on the western side another throne has a Sphinx for the support of the rail. These recall Echidna and Typhos, and the Tritons supporting the Amyklæan throne; while the floral decoration may serve as a clue to where the figures on the Amyklæan throne were placed. The throne of Zeus at Olympia, again, which was of this same shape, had the sphinx-supports for the arms, and sculptures along the bars between the legs of the throne, and on the throne. But the closest parallel is to be found on the coins of Aenos, where a similar problem to that at Amyklæ had been met. The people at Aenos had a terminal figure of Hermes, whom they wished to provide with a throne: as he

could not sit down, they put him to stand on the seat. This step could not be taken at Amyklæ, because of the basis, on which Apollo was already planted: but, though the connection between Apollo and his throne was less close than that between Hermes and his,—as is shown by the fact that the coins of Aenos have the god and his throne together, those of Amyklæ the god alone,—the parallel in other respects may be found very near. Hermes at Aenos stood on a throne of the shape described with arm-rests supported by sphinxes, and terminating in rams' heads: and the legs were apparently richly decorated. The throne from the Sabouroff collection, quoted by Furtwängler, is apparently a translation of this form into terracotta.

Taking these analogies as giving the general shape of the throne, two minor problems are left—the supporters and the seat. With regard to the former, Pausanias says that the throne was supported, in front and behind, by two figures of Graces and two of Seasons: which, if the names were not simply attached to the figures by the inventive genius of guides, may perhaps point to the figures having been those of the four seasons. But Furtwängler, on the strength of an unnatural translation of the words of Pausanias, doubles the number of these supporters, and gives the throne four ordinary legs as well; and further plants Echidna and Typhos on the one side, and the Tritons on the other, as supporters of the bars between the legs. Apart from the unwarranted multiplication of female figures, this supposition puts the figures of Echidna, Typhos, and the Tritons, in positions which cannot be reconciled with the express statement of Pausanias: he begins his description of the scenes which decorated the throne from the Tritons, clearly showing that they were at the end; whereas Furtwängler would place them at intervals along the side, and suppose that Pausanias talked nonsense. He also, by the way, puts these four figures facing outwards, while all the other decoration according to his restoration looks inwards or forwards: though perhaps this exceptional treatment might be defended on the ground that, in these half-fish or half-snake forms, the most characteristic part was the tail. But the position of these is almost certain from the analogies already quoted. And when Pausanias says that the throne was upheld by four figures, what necessity is there for supposing that it was not, and that these four figures were not in place of the four legs?

With regard to the seat, the words of Pausanias are: 'The part of the throne, where the god would sit, is not in one piece, but makes several seats, with a space by each seat; and in the middle is a very wide space, wherein the statue stands.' This seems to imply an ordinary throne, with the seat left out, and round the edges of the vacant space small projections. Whether these really were seats or not, it is hard to say: perhaps they were slabs of stone, at the corners of the throne, serving the purpose of throwing the weight of the construction inwards. I confess I am not satisfied with this idea: but it seems to me more probable than any suggestions of previous restorers. The elaborate arrangement of Rühl, making a number of small seats with a winding stair leading up to each, supposes an impossibly large construction: and the semicircular cuttings suggested by de Quincy and Pyl are irreconcilable alike with the words of Pausanias and with common sense. As for Furtwängler's idea, that the several seats were arranged like the bars of a gridiron, it is hard to see how these, on which nothing could sit, could be called seats: moreover, his restoration disagrees with the description of Pausanias, which speaks of a space in the middle of where the seat should be, in which the statue stands; whereas Furtwängler fills up this space with an altar, and puts the statue to stand over it.

A considerable difficulty has been introduced into previous restorations by mistaken theories with regard to the size of the throne. For instance, Pyl and Rühl suppose the measurements of the ground-plan of the throne to have been about sixty feet square. Now, seeing that the statue was only forty-five feet high, and about seven feet in diameter, it is obvious that it would have been entirely dwarfed by a throne of this size; whereas the throne was intended to be purely an adjunct; and, moreover, if it was to be the seat of the god, it must have maintained some degree of proportion. The natural size of a throne, of the shape described, for a figure forty-five feet high, if it were to be seated, would be about twelve feet square and thirty-two feet high; but, as the statue was to stand, the measurements might be raised, and the back of the throne made to equal the height of the statue, when the seat would be about seventeen feet each way, and twenty-two feet from the ground. Now the foundation-wall discovered by Tsountas, which has been taken above to be

that which supported the back of the throne, is apparently seventeen or eighteen feet in length, to judge from his plan: which agrees perfectly with the supposed dimensions.

The material of the throne is nowhere mentioned, and on this point there has been no lack of controversy. The alternatives are stone, and wood overlaid with bronze or gold: the latter having been the general theory, while Heyne, Bötticher, and Rühl alone hold that the throne was of stone. For the present, arguments from the shape and size of the throne had better be put aside, as they generally lead from conjecture only to conjecture; and what is absolutely known be taken as a basis. Furtwängler has sufficiently shown that de Quincy and Klein were wrong in supposing that the decoration of the throne was of gold, since they based their theory on facts that are not mentioned by Pausanias and are contradicted by Theopompus—their two authorities. Bronze is more possible: but three arguments seem to make in favour of marble. In the first place, if a throne of bronze had been desired, the Lacedaemonians would not have needed to look beyond their own country for an artist; the school of Dipoeos and Skyllis was able to do any metal-work. But, when marble was to be the material, the superiority of the sculptors of Ionia and the islands was so unquestionable that the Lacedaemonians may well have asked Croesus to send them over a master, who could build them a throne of stone; in response to which Bathycles was sent, and his workmen with him. Secondly, all the remains, including some architectural fragments, found by Tsountas on the site at Amyklæ, are of marble: though the discoveries are not sufficient to make this argument of any value. And, in the third place, Pausanias expressly notes, with regard to two objects, that they were of bronze—namely the statue, and the door of the basis. The chief point of this description of material would be in the fact that the rest of the throne and its belongings was not of bronze. The only reference that makes in favour of bronze, is in one of the inscriptions found by Tsountas in the precinct, which speaks of the glitter of bronze therein; but this may mean simply the statue, which is known to have been of bronze. On the whole, it seems to be slightly more probable that the throne was of marble: and there would be no architectural difficulty, if the proportions of the throne above supposed are accepted: an architrave of seventeen

feet would not present any obstacle to an artist familiar with the temple then in building at Ephesus.

With regard to the decoration of the throne, it has been already seen that the supporters were four 'Caryatids,' about eighteen feet high, upon whose heads rested what may be termed an architrave and a frieze, which would be each about three feet wide, and represented the seat of the throne. At the back columns rose about twenty-one feet higher; and the arms of the throne were each supported by two figures—on the one side Tritons, on the other Echidna and Typhos. The throne was covered with sculptured scenes—as to the arrangement of which Pausanias says nothing, simply giving a list. The only hint he supplies is when, after going through a catalogue, he breaks off, and starts afresh with the words 'And when one goes under the throne, there are on the inside—'; from which it is evident that up to this point he has been describing scenes visible from outside; that is, it is natural to suppose, scenes on the outside of the throne. And this theory has been accepted by every one, till Furtwängler formulated an idea that the scenes were outside in the sense of being outside the seat, on to which the visitor had to climb to see them. This, of course, presupposes that there was a seat. But Pausanias does not mention the fact of his climbing up to see these sculptures. Moreover, there is no analogy for such decoration of the back of a throne: the instance, figured by Furtwängler, of a terracotta throne with crossing beams at the back and depressions between, which depressions he imagines to have been for the insertion of a sort of metopes, looking much more like an attempt to represent in terracotta an ordinary back of beams, the spaces between them being filled, as the material required, instead of left open; and it further seems out of the question that a part of the throne which would be almost entirely hidden from view by the statue should have this decoration lavished on it, while the outside of the throne, which would be visible to every one who walked round it, was left unadorned. Furtwängler's theory may be dismissed, therefore, as unsupported and unnatural: and the division, according to Pausanias, into scenes inside and outside followed. In the disposal of these, the earliest restorers supposed that there were two long rows, as it were friezes: and spent much care in arranging the scenes so as to produce a balance. But, as these theories

all proceed either on the purely gratuitous assumption that Pausanias did not describe the scenes in the order in which he saw them, and that therefore the restorer may pick out one scene here and another there at his pleasure; or on the convenient method of forgetting the principle of balance entirely when it is inconvenient; it will be sufficient to take as an example the latest and most elaborate exponent of this school—Klein. He supposes the whole series to have been based on the number seven, and arranges twenty-eight scenes outside, on the two side walls and in two tiers on the back, fourteen inside on the sides, and seven above on the back: each group of seven being composed of one long frieze at the top of the section of the throne, and three scenes down each end, treated in square fields. But, in order to get this result, it is necessary to suppose that Pausanias described in one breath scenes on different parts of the throne, and that he went from one side to another and returned to the back—an unnatural order; and, it is also necessary to treat scenes as friezes or metopes in an arbitrary manner, and balance them anyhow; thus Klein makes the 'chorus of the Phaeacians' into a metope, and balances this by the solitary figure of Atlas; or, again, crowds 'the Trojans bringing libations to Hector' into a square field. The whole arrangement is hopelessly artificial and forced. There seems no reason for questioning that the decoration was all in long friezes, without any marked division of scenes; and this may account for Pausanias separating in his description figures belonging to the same scene—as where he speaks of Atlas as though his figure stood by itself, whereas it almost certainly belongs to the scene he has just described, of the carrying off of the daughters of Atlas. The words of Pausanias, 'the decoration within, beginning from the Tritons,' imply a line of figures leading away from the end of the arm of the throne: and no hint is given of any change of direction. A line of figures upon either the architrave or the frieze, accepting the measurements given above, would stand almost three feet high; and there would be room for sixteen or seventeen figures along each side. Now, according to Pausanias, there were on the inside about forty-five figures in fourteen scenes: on the outside, about eighty-five in twenty-seven. It would appear, therefore, that on the inside there was a single line of sculptures, on the architrave, the frieze being broken up by the 'seats' projecting

from it: on the outside, a double line, on both the architrave and the frieze. There were also certain figures which Pausanias describes separately, upon the back of the throne—the Dioscuri ‘beside the finials at the top,’—under their horses, ‘sphinxes, and beasts running upwards’—and, ‘at the top of all,’ Bathykles and his fellow-workman. That is to say, on the posts of the back were sculptured, on either side, one of the Dioscuri, below him a sphinx, and below that a rampant animal; and on the top rail, a row of figures. It would not be necessary to dwell further on this point, if Furtwängler had not attempted to get a wholly impossible sense out of Pausanias; translating *πρὸς τοῖς ἀνω πέρασιν* by ‘sculptured on the upper finials’—and *θηρία ἀνω θέοντα* by ‘beasts on the top running.’ After this, it is unnecessary to linger over his theory as to their arrangement.

To discuss the scenes represented in their mythographical aspect would be foreign to the purpose of this paper. But one point should receive attention—namely, whether there were inscriptions under the figures. Klein, with whom Furtwängler agrees, argues that there must have been inscriptions: but, in the case of the throne, his only grounds are probabilities. From what other source, he asks, would Pausanias get the names of Oreios and Thourios, Megapenthes and Nikostratos? These names sound much more like local inventions than like genuine relics of earlier mythology; and Klein is obliged to allow that there need not have been names throughout—as Demodokos and the chorus of Phaeacians, for instance, must be wrongly named. It seems much more natural to suppose that there were no names, and that Pausanias supplied them from his own imagination, or, when that failed him, from the unflinching invention of a guide or guardian. The words with which he prefaces his catalogue of the scenes almost imply this—‘most were not hard to recognize’; which, if there were inscriptions, would mean that he deliberately attempted to deceive his readers. Besides, inscriptions, unless out of all proportion to the figures, would have been useless at the height at which, on any theory, some of the scenes must have been placed. There is, however, one strong argument in favour of inscriptions—which applies only to the basis. Klein points out that *Bépis* and *Θεορίαδαι* are probably misreadings on the part of Pausanias, who was unacquainted with the archaic digamma and aspirate. But, even if the sculptures on

the basis were, what the basis itself certainly was not—the work of Bathykles—the inscriptions here would be legible, and therefore there would be more reason for placing them. And these very inscriptions furnish an argument against the attribution of this work to Bathykles; since he would not have used the Laconian form of the alphabet, which puzzled Pausanias, but his native Ionian letters. The conclusion is, then, that the basis, which was not the work of Bathykles, had, but the throne, which was, had not, its figures named.

To speak, finally, of the artist. Nothing is known of Bathykles, save what Pausanias tells here—that he was of Magnesia—and a fact mentioned by Plutarch, that at Delphi there was a cup, said to be of Croesus or Bathykles; the latter pointing to a connection, reasons for supposing which have already been given. Klein connects him with the Samian artist family—on the evidence of the similarity of his name to that of Telekles; an argument which can hardly be taken seriously. There seems no other reason for setting aside the definite statement of Pausanias as to his birth-place. And, if any clue to his style is to be found, it will unquestionably be in the sculptures from the temple at Ephesus executed by his countrymen and contemporaries, if not by himself.

J. GRAFTON MILNE.

SCHULTZE ON EARLY CHRISTIAN ART.

Archäologie der altchristlichen Kunst, von VICTOR SCHULTZE, Professor an d. U. Greifswald. Munich: Beck. 8vo. 1895. Pp. xii. + 382, with 120 illustrations in text. 10 Mk.

PROFESSOR SCHULTZE is well known as the author of a book on the Catacombs and of numerous papers on early Christian antiquities. He claims in his preface that the present work embodies the results of nearly twenty years' study, and no one can question his competence or authority.

The period covered ends with the building of St. Sophia at Constantinople, a natural and convenient limit for ancient history, but one which in the case of Christian art does not mark any real break in continuity.

The handbook is built on the German system which Iwan Müller's series has made familiar to us. The text is concise

and continuous with abundant notes on the authorities and the bibliography, and digressions in small type describing individual monuments.

It is divided into sections on architecture, painting (including mosaics), sculpture, the minor arts and iconography. An introduction gives a sketch of the history of the study of Christian antiquities and of the relation of Christian to Pagan art.

This arrangement according to subject matter admits of a full treatment of the development of the different arts, but has the great drawback of divorcing things so intimately allied as architecture, sculpture, and painting, and making it difficult to form a clear idea of the characteristics of any given place or of local variations from the general type. Thus we find the Catacombs treated of under each of the five different heads, and have to consult the index and look up the references if we desire to form an idea of them as a whole.

To those familiar with the monuments this is a small matter, but even serious students would be glad to have some short account of the general characteristics of Syrian, Coptic, and North African, not to speak of Byzantine, art. No doubt the limits of a handbook make this impossible.

In the section on architecture, the author is a strong upholder of the theory of the direct evolution of the basilica from the dwelling-house of classical times. He regards the Greek house with a single court as the origin of the Eastern type, where the fore-court is wanting, and the Graeco-Roman house with *atrium*, *tablinum*, and *peristylum* as the origin of the Western. He combats the traditional theory of the conversion of Roman basilicas into churches, or even the assumption that their architecture was borrowed from pagan basilicas. Yet the 'dwelling-house' theory cannot be received without reserve. If nothing else, it is extremely uncritical to take the type of the Attic house of the 5th century B.C., to place it beside the Graeco-Roman house of Pompeii, and regard them as both equally prototypes of public buildings of the fourth century A.D. Besides the hypothesis implies that the *peristylum* is an Italian addition to the Greek house.

There is the further objection that it is assumed that the *tablinum* was the scene of the sacramental ritual, that in process of time the *peristylum* ceased to be a garden, and was roofed over for the reception of the congregation, that the *atrium* was unroofed and changed its place to become a fore-court

to the *peristylum*. This seems somewhat violent.

The natural inference is that though the dwelling-house was the original meeting-place of the church and gave a distinctive form to its ritual, it was not the direct prototype of the basilica. The very name proves this. When an emperor wished to build a 'palace' rather than a 'house' for God, he was scarcely likely to take the ordinary house in the street as his model. The apse and the nave with colonnades and aisles are the marks of a large public building, are also characteristic of the basilica, and are what we should expect in a church built near or in a palace. The raised 'tribunal' and the chancel rails also suggest a basilica of the type preserved in the Domus Augustana on the Palatine and have no direct connection with the structure of a private house. Further in a palace there was not the same strict adherence to the typical plan of house; witness Diocletian's palace at Spalato, built on the model of a camp, in which the *peristylum* lies in front of the private apartments of the emperor. It seems then a safer hypothesis to look to the palaces rather than the Pompeian or Athenian house for the source of the basilica.

In the account of the domed basilica, Professor Schultze, though he quotes Swainson and Lethaby's *Santa Sophia* (1894), does not seem to have read it. He omits all mention of Jackson's *Dalmatia*, though he refers to Salona, Aquileia and Grado. Among other omissions, are Prof. Baldwin Browne's *From Schola to Cathedral*, 1886, and Headlam's *Ecclesiastical Sites in Isauria* (Hell. Soc. Suppl. 1892).

In the sketch of martyrs' tombs and chapel one looks in vain for an account of the remarkable *memoria*, which lies round the walls and under the foundations of the basilica at Salona.

The section on iconography is very disappointing, though this is due more to the difficulty of treating the subject without adequate illustration. Here too the works of Mrs. Jameson and Mrs. Twining (though not scientific, and treating as a rule of later periods) might have been mentioned.

Yet with all its shortcomings the book is an admirable piece of work, when one considers the state of our knowledge and the numerous pitfalls that beset an inquirer. Prof. Schultze is eminently impartial, and we should judge that he is a Protestant—but this is only a surmise from the fact that he shows but little sympathy for

ecclesiastical matters or theology except as illustrating evolution. This will make his book all the more useful to archaeological students and may perhaps be a welcome change even to the professed theologian.

W. C. F. ANDERSON.

MONTHLY RECORD.

ITALY.

Fontanellato, near Parma. Excavations here have given additional support to the theory that the prehistoric settlements of the Po valley represent the elementary plan of the early Italian and Roman cities. The settlement was divided into four large quarters, each of which again was divided into *insulae* by cross-streets.¹

GREECE.

Athens.—The task of deciphering, by the aid of the nail-prints, the bronze inscription which once stood on the eastern architrave of the Parthenon, has been successfully accomplished by Mr. E. Andrews, of the American School. His results are as follows:—*ἡ ἐξ Ἀρείου πάγου βουλὴ καὶ ἡ βουλὴ τῶν Χ. καὶ ὁ δῆμος ὁ Ἀθηναίων αυτοκράτορα μέγιστον Νέρωνα Καίσαρα Κλαύδιον Σεβαστὸν Γερμανικὸν Θεοῦ Τίδιν στρατηγούντος ἐπὶ τοὺς ὁπλίτας τὸ ὄγδοον τοῦ καὶ ἐπιμελητοῦ καὶ νομοθέτου Τι. Κλαυδίου Νονίου τοῦ Φιλίνου ἐπὶ ἱερείας . . . τῆς . . . θυγατρὸς.*

The reference to the eighth term of Novius' generalship fixes the date at A.D. 61. It probably accompanied the erection of a statue of Nero, perhaps just in front of the Parthenon.

The British School has been undertaking excavations which may give important results for the topography of ancient Athens. The site of the suburb of Kynosarges was for a long time thought to lie on the south-eastern side of Lykabettos; but recently Dr. Dörpfeld has made it clear from the testimony of ancient authors that it lay further to the south, along the banks of the Ilissos. The Director of the School has had his attention drawn to a spot on the south bank of the river, several hundred yards below the Stadion, where the ground falls away abruptly from a small plateau, on either side of which are two prominent hills, probably those mentioned by ancient authors in connection with Kynosarges. A trench was dug through the plateau and brought to light walls of the Roman period, one of the constructions being undoubtedly a *calidarium*, which would point to the existence of a gymnasium (for which Kynosarges was famous). Fragments of Greek vases and various metal objects were excavated, also the remains of a large vase of Melian type. The extent of the ruins and solid

character of the masonry shows that this must have been the site of a large group of buildings, and it may reasonably be hoped that further research will prove the site to be that of Kynosarges.²

H. B. WALTERS.

Revue Numismatique. Part 1, 1896.

E. Babelon. 'L'éléphant d'Annibal. Deals with the small bronze coins, with *obr.* negro's head, *rev.* elephant, found in Etruria and near lake Trasimene. Babelon thinks that the elephant connects the coins with the Italian expedition of Hannibal and not (as Garrucci thought) with that of Pyrrhus. These pieces may therefore have been struck *circa* 217 B.C. in some Etrurian town that espoused the cause of Hannibal. The animal represented may possibly be the elephant on which Hannibal rode at the battle of the Trasimene (Liv. xxii. 2). This explanation seems on several grounds to be preferable to Garrucci's, but, if correct, it furnishes one of the comparatively rare instances of the occurrence of a purely historical 'type' on ancient coins.—J. Blanchet. 'Les fonctions des triumvirs monétaires romains.' On the *tresviri aere, argento, auro, flando, feriundo*. Modern writers have generally supposed that the *tresviri* were first appointed when silver coinage was introduced at Rome (B.C. 269). But the first regular gold coinage of Rome belongs to B.C. 87, and there is a difficulty in ascertaining the functions of these officers who are mentioned *auro flando* at least as early as B.C. 100. Blanchet supposes that the original duty of the *tresviri* was to superintend the Treasury reserves kept in the form of cast ingots of gold and silver—'lateres argentei atque auri primum conflati atque in aerarium conditi.' This would account for the mention of *tresviri auro flando* previous to the introduction of the gold coinage.—*Chronique*. Contains notices of several recent finds.—*Revue*. V. Bérard's 'De l'origine des cultes arcadiens,' by Babelon; Gabrici's 'Contributo alla Storia della moneta romana' (Augustus to Domitian) by Babelon. F. Gnecchi's 'Monete romane' (elementary manual), Milan, 1896.

Revue Suisse, v. 1895.

This periodical, which rarely contains papers on classical numismatics, has an article by Dr. Imhoof-Blumer, 'Zur Münzkunde Kleinasien.' It deals mainly with the coins of Hierokaisareia in Lydia. A bronze coin with the type of the Persian Artemis and the inscription IEP is attributed to Hierakome (cp. Polyb. xvi. 1; xxxii. 25). In the same article Imhoof-Blumer gives a summary of some results that he has arrived at during a recent study of the coins of Lydia, etc. Thus, he points out that Mossyna and Thyessos in Lydia did not strike coins, and that a coin hitherto supposed to have been struck at Selinus in Cilicia by Iotape, queen of Commagene, is really a misread coin of Hermocapelia unconnected with Iotape.

WARWICK WROTH.

¹ *Athenaeum*, 28 March.

² *Academy*, 4 April.

SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS.

Neue Jahrbücher für Philologie und Paedagogik. Vol. 153. Part 1. 1896.

Der Kynionismus und die grundfragen der Homerischen textkritik, A. Ludwich. A criticism of Cauer's latest book 'Grundfragen der Homer-kritik' (Leipzig 1895). *Zu Sophokles Aias*, O. Puschmann. In 706 proposes *ἄνω ἔπειν ἔχος κ.τ.λ.* *Die topographischen angaben der Ilias und die ergebnisse der ausgrabungen auf Hissarlik*, H. Kluge. Considers (1) What can be learnt of a town below Troy from the Iliad and the various discoveries? (2) Walls, towers and gates, especially the Scaean gate, (3) Houses, palaces, and places, (4) Tumuli. *Nachträgliches zu Aristoteles 'Αθηναίων πολιτεία*, F. Blass. [Cl. Rev. ix. 478.] Points out where his readings differ from Wilcken's in *Hermes* vol. 30. *Zu Demosthenes rede für Phormion*, C. Rüger. Critical and explanatory notes on various sections. Fick's *die griechischen personennamen* rev. C. Augermann. A work that does great honour to German industry and German knowledge. *Zu Sophokles Electra*, Th. Plüss. Some criticisms of and additions to a number of passages treated by Vahlen in *Berliner ind. lect.* 1895. *Zu Ovidius ex Ponto*, H. Gilbert. In iv. 13, 23 punctuates as follows *materialiam quæris? laudes: de Cesare dixi.* *Die beischriften des Wolfenbütler Propertius-codex Gud.* 224, K. Dziatzko. *Zu Livius*, K. Hachtmann. In i. 51, 3 would read *prima nocte for una nocte*, the numeral I having been wrongly taken for *una* instead of *prima*, cf. Dion. Hal. iv. 47. W. Soltan. Considers whether in xxvi. 7 Livy has not followed Polybius directly. Criticizes Bethé's dissertation (ind. lect. Rostoch. 1895) on the sources of Livy's account of Hannibal's march from Capua against Rome. *Zu Lucanus de bello civili*, L. Paul. In i. 4 proposes to read *ut for et...certatum (sibi)*, so as to avoid having to take *datum, conversum*, and *certatum* as infinitives. *Ein mittelalterliches Liebesgedicht*, R. Helm. A short poem of twenty-one lines from the bibl. Barberina at Rome, already published in Novati's 'carmina mediæ ævi' (1883).

Part 2. A. von Gutschmidt's *Kleinen schriften* ed. F. Bühl, rev. W. Schmid. There are 5 vols. devoted respectively to Egyptology, and history of Greek chronography, history and literature of the Semitic peoples and old Church-history, history and literature of the non-Semitic peoples of Asia, Greek history and literature, history and literature of Rome and the middle ages. *Zur etymologie einiger griechischen götternamen*, A. Döhning. Treats of (1) Rheia and Kronos, (2) Priapos, (3) Hephaistos. *Obscurationes grammaticæ*, L. Radermacher. On *δεῖν—δέν, δέν—δὴ ἔν, εἰς—τίς, ἔδεν—λέγειν, ἀρεῖν—μέγαν ἀρεῖν, ἔδεν ἔλάν, εἰ καὶ—εἰ δὴ, εἰρεῖν—λέγειν, ταῦτ—ταῦτα* and the like, *τινὲς οἱ, οὔτε, ἀλλ' οὐδέ, πρῶτος, νόμος, φύσις—ὁ νόμος, ἡ φύσις*. *Zu Sophokles Aias*, E. Holzner. In 510 proposes *εἰ νέος | τροφὸς στερεθῆς κ.τ.λ.* *Nepos und Plutarchos*, W. Soltan. The debt of P. to N. has not yet been acknowledged. N. was his most important biographical authority. *Drei selbstbeziehungen in den Silven des Statius*, J. Ziehen. In iv. 3, 19 keeps the MSS *luminæ...calvum*. Finds other references to time in i. 5, 60 foll. and ii. 2, 30 foll. *Kritische Kleinigkeiten*, A. Weidner. Some places in Tacitus and Horace noticed. *Die angeblichen meridiene der*

tabula Peutingeriana, K. Miller. Against Cuntz who sought to show that the author had taken certain meridians from Ptolemy. It is maintained that the attempt to find a mathematical foundation for the table is in vain.

Rheinisches Museum. Vol. 51. Part 2. 1896.

Ueber die Schriftstellerei des Klaudios Galenos iii., J. Ilberg. Continued from vol. 47 (1892). The order of the composition of his pathological and therapeutic works is here considered, and a conjectural table of his writings is given from his first residence in Rome (after 163) to the time of Septimius Severus (after 193). *Die Textgeschichte des Rutilius*, C. Hosius. Contains the results of an investigation of a MS. in the library of the Duke of Sermoneta at Rome derived from the Bobiensis. *Die panathenäischen und eleusinischen ιεροποιῖαι*, L. Ziehen. Supplements the dissertation of Schöll (1887) on the Athenian 'Festkommissionen' by information derived from the *Ἀθην. πολιτεία* which was not then available. *Das Verhältniss der aristotelischen zu der thukydeideischen Darstellung des Tyrannenmordes*, P. Corsen. Agrees with Stahl [Cl. Rev. ix. 430] in rejecting the account of *Ἀθ. πολ.* that Thessalos and not Hipparchos was the lover of Harmodios, as against the usual version given by Thucydides. *Beiträge zur lateinischen Grammatik*, ii., Th. Birt. Continued from last number. This paper is on the shortenings of trochaic words. *Die Theosophie des Aristokritos*, A. Brinkmann. In this lost work A. attempted to show an essential identity between Hellenism, Christianity, and Manichæism. *Die Amtstracht der Vestalinnen*, H. Dragendorff. With two illustrations from statues excavated from the former. The chastity of the Vestal Virgin was compared to that of a wife not that of a virgin. She was the bride of the godhead, just as the Christian virgin, vowed to a religious life, is the bride of Christ.

MISCELLAN. *Ein nominaler Ablativus Singularis im Griechischen*, F. Solmsen. Finds an abl. in the word *Φοῖβω* in an inscr. recently found at Delphi, which Homolle explains as a gen. *Das Zeugniß der delphischen Hymnen über den griechischen accent*, J. Wackernagel. *Noch einmal das vortheiseische Athen*, J. M. Stahl. A reply to Dörpfeld in the last number [sup. p. 77]. *Ad Simonis Atheniensis fragmentum addendum*, E. Oder. Contains some remarks of Mr. Kenyon on a fragment of Simon contained in a Brit. Mus. MS. [sup. p. 77]. *De Phoenicis loco*, L. Radermacher. Correction of a fragment in Athenæus 530 e. *Zu Philodem περὶ κολακείας*, M. Ihm. Some fragments in vol. i. of the second collection of the *Volumina Herculanensia* pp. 74-83 emended. *Nachtrag zu 'Zwei neu aufgefundenen Schriften der græco-syrischen Literatur'*, V. Ryssel. The Greek text of this has now been discovered [sup. p. 77]. *Die Fescenninen*, E. Hoffmann. Compares Hor. ep. 2, 1, 139 foll. and Verg. Geo. 2, 385 foll. and distrusts the account of Hor. in some particulars. *Zum Gedicht des Pseudosolinus*, F. B. Varia, C. Weyman. Notes on Acts 28, 16, Juvenecus, Damasus, Prudentius, and *digna dignis* referred to by Bücheler in sup. vol. 46 as a proverbial saying.

Mnemosyne. N. S. Vol. xxiv. Part 2. 1896.

Ad Tacitum, E. B. Koster. On Ann. iii. 28, iii. 30, Hist. ii. 70, and some passages of Dial. de Or. and Agric. *Conjectanea ad Aeschylæ Orestæam*, L. A. J. Burgersdijk. With special reference to the conjectures of Wecklein, Weil, Hermann and Keck. *Observatiunculæ de jure Romano*, J. C. Naber. Continued. (1) De publica prædiorum traditione, (2) de clandestina possessione recuperanda, (3) quando possessio ab justo possessore transferatur, (4) interdictis retinendæ possessionis recuperandi vim inesse. *Ad Corpus Inscriptionum Rhodiarum*, H. van Gelder. Continued from last number. *Petrinus* c. 52, J. van der Vliet. Proposes *nam modo*

fortunam suam <verebatur>, for *nam modo Fortunatam <verebatur>*. *Emendantur Scholia Græca in Aristophanis Pacem*, H. van Herwerden. *Ad Thucydidis* vii. 56, 2, J. v. L. For ὑπὸ τῶν ἔπειτα πολὺ θαυμασθήσεσθαι proposes ὑπὸ τῶν ἐκεῖ π. θ. *Codex Apulei Dorvillianus*, J. van der Vliet. *Adnotationes criticae ad Taciti Annales et Historias*, J. C. G. Boot. *Ad Sophoclis Electrae* vs. 1370 sq., J. v. L. Thinks that Soph. wrote τούτοις τε < τοῖς > < καὶ > νεῦ σοφοῖς | < κ > ἄλλοις τούτων πλείοσιν. *Quid est τὸ ὑπηρέσιον?* P. H. Damsté. Defends the old meaning (cushion) of this word against Breusing (*Die Lösung der Trierenrätsels* p. 110), and against S. A. Naber (*Mnemos.* vol. 23, p. 265). [*Cl. Rev.* ix. 429.]